WILLIAMSBURG BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MINUTES

September 6, 2005

The regular meeting of the Williamsburg Board of Zoning Appeals was held on Tuesday, September 6, 2005 at 4:00 p.m. in the Williamsburg Municipal Building, 401 Lafayette Street.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Board members Knudson, Kafes, Carr, Lamson and White. Staff members present were Zoning Administrator Murphy, Assistant City Attorney Workman and Secretary Scott.

CALL TO ORDER and MINUTES

Chairman Knudson called the meeting to order. Mr. Carr moved that the minutes of the August 2, 2005 meeting be approved. Mr. Lamson seconded the motion which carried by roll call vote of 5-0.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: L

Lamson, Carr, Knudson, Kafes, White

No:

None

Absent: None

PUBLIC HEARINGS

BZA #05-015:

Request of Lone-G Inc. to appeal the decision of the Zoning Administrator contained in a letter dated April 26, 2005 determining that 101 Chandler Court is a single-family dwelling. The property is identified on Williamsburg Tax Map Number 495-0A-00-016, and is zoned Single Family Dwelling District RS-2. Upheld the Zoning Administrator's decision.

Chairman Knudson introduced the appeal and noted the following Board members have visited the site, both indoors and out:

Knudson, Kafes, Carr, Lamson and White

The minutes continue as set forth in the attached transcript.

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Lone G, Inc. (the "Appellant") has submitted application **BZA #05-015** appealing the Zoning Administrator's decision contained in a letter dated April 26, 2005 that the improvements erected on 101 Chandler Court may be occupied only as a single-family dwelling; and

Williamsburg Board of Zoning Appeals Minutes September 6, 2005

WHEREAS, the Appellant claims a valid nonconforming use status for the subject property that allows it to be legally occupied as three single-family dwelling units; and

WHEREAS, the property is located at 101 Chandler Court, Williamsburg Tax Map Number 495-(0A)-00-016 and is zoned RS-2, Single Family Dwelling District; and

WHEREAS, after giving notice as required by Section 15.2-2312 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, the City of Williamsburg Board of Zoning Appeals proceeded to hear the appeal on September 6, 2005, at which hearing all interested persons in attendance were allowed to speak; and

NOW, THEREFORE, after careful consideration of all documentation before them; the presentations by the Appellant and its attorney; presentations by the zoning administrator and the assistant city attorney and statements received from various interested persons at the public hearing; and further after hearing arguments of the attorneys for the Appellant and the city, the Board finds:

- 1. That as of 1966 and at all times thereafter, the zoning laws of the City of Williamsburg limited the use and occupancy of the subject property to single-family dwelling purposes.
- 2. That while prior to 1966, the zoning laws of the City of Williamsburg did allow two-family dwelling usage of the property, there is no evidence that such property was used for anything other than a single-family dwelling and that in 1966 when the property was rezoned to limit its use to single-family dwelling purposes, the property was being used and occupied as a single-family dwelling.
- 3. That the City's Permit records from 1950 to present do not indicate any legal change in use of the property from a single-family dwelling.
- 4. That Copies of leases provided by the Appellant fail to establish that the property was ever legally used and occupied as a two-family dwelling while the City's zoning ordinance allowed such use.
- 5. That the Appellant bears the burden of proof to establish the valid nonconforming use status of the property.
- 6. That the Appellant has failed to show by a preponderance of evidence that the property enjoys a legal nonconforming use status that would allow its use and occupancy for any purpose other than uses allowed in the City's RS-2 Single-Family Dwelling District, which uses do not include multi-family dwellings.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City of Williamsburg Board of Zoning Appeals on this the 6th day of September 2005 that the request of Lone G, Inc. to reverse the decision of the Zoning Administrator as contained in the letter of April 26, 2005 **is hereby denied**. The Board further finds that the Zoning Administrator's decision contained in the April 26, 2005 letter is correct and upholds such decision.

Williamsburg Board of Zoning Appeals Minutes September 6, 2005

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye:

Knudson, Kafes, Carr, Lamson, White

No:

None

Absent: None

OLD BUSINESS - None

NEW BUSINESS – None

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Knudson, Chairman Board of Zoning Appeals

1			
2			
3			
4		WILLIAMSBURG BOARD OF	
5		ZONING APPEALS	
6			
7		Comboniban C. 2005	
8		September 6, 2005 4:00 p.m.	
9			
10		Second Floor 401 Lafayette Street	
11		Williamsburg, Virginia 23185	
12			
13			
14		000	
15			
16			
17			
18	BOARD MEMBERS:	Judy Knudson, Chairman William H. Carr	
19		Elizabeth White David R. Lamson	
20		William O. Kafes	
21	ALSO PRESENT:	Christina Workman, Counsel	
22		Dee Scott, Secretary Carolyn Murphy, Zoning Administrator	
23			
24			
25		Reported and transcribed by: Brenda Lewis Caputo, CCR	
		COPY	

- - -

(Recording of the proceedings began as follows:)

MS. KNUDSON: So please address only this matter. Mr. Tarley?

MR. TARLEY: Good afternoon, Madam Chair.

My name's John Tarley, and I'm a resident of the city. And

I'm representing Lone-G, Incorporated. With me somewhere in

the mass of people back there is Greg Granger who's a

principal in Lone-G.

We're here on appeal of the zoning administrator's decision as set forth in the letter in which she indicated the property at 101 Chandler Court does not have nonconforming rights to any additional units beyond a single-family dwelling.

Today we will show that the property located at 101 Chandler Court has established a lawful nonconforming use as set forth in the 1966 city of Williamsburg ordinance, has maintained that lawful nonconforming use since then without any interruption of 24 consecutive months.

In summary, we'll show that Section 26-9 of the '66 ordinance sets forth the principal use for this dwelling as a single-family dwelling, and as an accessory

use, the property may be used for renting of rooms to residence boarders. We will show that since at least 1979, the property has been used principally as a one-family dwelling as defined in the ordinance with a lawful accessory use of the renting of rooms for residence boarders.

Upon the purchase of Mr. Granger's property as you've seen as you walk through, the property's experienced an exciting rejuvenation. I walk, and when I'm really motivated jog, past that house several times in the course of a month and anybody can see the remarkable makeover of the house as you can see both internally and externally. I have some photos here that I'll just pass around. It shows the extent of some of the work that's been done on the home. You can compare it with what you saw today.

Furthermore, there was some discussion at our last -- prior to the public hearing being continued about some concerns over certain things with student rentals, and I have an e-mail here I would share, and I couldn't put it in my packet because I just received it as well, that references the only calls coming to the city of Williamsburg police since May of 2004 was a stolen bike report and a burglar alarm in that year and several months since then.

Mr. Granger's received many positive

comments about the transformation of the house there. I think he's made a strong rejuvenation of that property, and I think he should be commended for his contribution to the area. Not withstanding that, clearly that's not the issue before us today. But some history is in order for this property and for this neighborhood.

Rentals and boarders in the Chandler

Court/Pollard Park area are nothing new. Behind Tab No. 1,

I provided you an excerpt from the application to put the

Pollard Park/Chandler Court on the national register of

historic places that Mr. Smith had put together for the

neighborhood. And as set forth on this Tab 1 and in that

particular application, the people living in the district

were not always homeowners. 706 Pollard Park included

roomers on the upper floor; 134 Chandler Court was a

sorority, and I think there were a couple other properties

that were sororities within that. One Ballard Lane was

rented to faculty. 207 Griffin Avenue, 131, 134 and 140

Chandler Court included apartments rented to William and

Mary students.

Clearly, this isn't an area that has been immune to William and Mary students and faculty. And as the Board is aware, properties in the Chandler Court/Pollard area to this day maintain rentals. And not that that is entirely relevant to the issue before us; however, it is

accurate to assert that rentals to students and faculty in that area are as much a part of the history of Chandler Court as any other use.

With respect to the legal issue, the property has established a nonconforming use. As Ms. Murphy set forth in her letter, the property was zoned Residence B prior to the change to its current zoning designation in 1991.

26-9(1)(a) which I believe is in the packet that was provided to you by the zoning administrator sets forth the principal use as a one-family dwelling.

26-9(2)(c) permits as an accessory use a building to be used for the renting of rooms to residence boarders.

Since at least 1979 when David Andrews moved there, the property has been used principally as a one-family dwelling as defined in the ordinance in place at the time with an accessory use as a renting of the rooms to boarders. Until 2004, Mr. Andrews resided in one area of the house and rented the remainder of the house to the boarders as permitted by the ordinance.

Tab 2 has an affidavit from Mr. Andrews in which he sets forth more particulars of the summary I just provided of the 25 years that he lived there. Tabs 3 through 8 set forth a representative sample of the written leases of the property in which Mr. Andrews rented rooms to

boarders.

I've separated each tab. The property changed hands several times between Mr. Andrews and a couple other individuals. A company in which Mr. Andrews was a principal owned the property for a while, was transferred back to Mr. Andrews, and each of those tabs separates that particular period of time.

I recognize that many of the citizens that are present here today will speak against this appeal, principally that the stated use by the property owner is inconsistent with the neighborhood and inconsistent with the current use of the neighborhood. And although as I indicated earlier I believe that's a debatable presumption based upon the long time use and the current use of those rentals, I submit to you it's relevant, because this appeal simply asks the Board to determine that a lawful nonconforming use has been established for the property to rent rooms to boarders under the conditions set forth in the '66 zoning ordinance and then to determine that this nonconforming use has continued without interruption for any 24 consecutive month period.

The information provided in the packet in this presentation demonstrates that the prior owner, David Andrews, and various other entities in which he was a member established a lawful accessory use, the principal use being

As you could see when we were there, the property has clearly maintained separate entrances, separate meters by Virginia Power, separate service by the postal service. For 25 years running, the property has been used principally as a single-family dwelling with an accessory use.

The zoning ordinance changed in 1991 as set forth by Ms. Murphy, and it made this use lawfully nonconforming. That lawful nonconforming use has continued without interruption. Based upon that, I would respectfully request that the Board reverse the decision of the zoning administrator, find that the property does have a lawful nonconforming use as set forth in the '66 ordinance, 26-9, and that the lawful nonconforming use has continued uninterrupted and in nonconformance to the current ordinance for any 24 consecutive month period.

I wanted to answer any questions that you may have.

MS. KNUDSON: Thank you. Are there any

questions from the Board? Ms. White?

MS. WHITE: I have a couple of questions and other Board members may as well.

Mr. Tarley, you've presented us with an awful lot of information. Most of what I have been able to see just thumbing through this fairly quickly takes -- if you were to take the affidavit that you have of Mr. Andrews behind Tab No. 2, this takes us back to 1982.

MR. TARLEY: Correct.

MS. WHITE: Now, is it your position by not supplying any information prior to 1982 that what happened between 1966 and '82, is it relevant?

MR. TARLEY: I don't have it. That's all it simply means. And I would submit that it wouldn't be relevant because the ordinance in 1982 was what it was in 1966. It wasn't until subsequent to that that the zoning ordinance changed to make it a nonconforming use.

MS. WHITE: And it is your position since you don't have it -- and, forgive me, I wasn't at the last hearing so I'm playing catch-up a little bit.

MR. TARLEY: We didn't do anything at the last hearing.

MS. WHITE: I'm going by what the minutes say. The minutes from our last hearing indicate that you acknowledge that the Applicant would have the burden of

proof of showing uninterrupted consecutive use going all the way back to 1966. MR. CARR: The minutes I have say 1947. MR. TARLEY: Well, in 1947, the ordinance was using it as a one- or a two-family dwelling. changed in 1966 to where it was just a one-family dwelling. I submit that upon further review, I don't think it's our burden to show that it goes all the way back to 1966 so long as it was a lawful use which it would have been in 1982 because you were still under the 1966 ordinance. It doesn't mean -- there are many uses that you can have of the property. You don't have to use them all. But once you use them and it's a lawful use and then it becomes nonconforming, it has to continue uninterrupted. MS. WHITE: So by taking the position it was a lawful use in 1982, that it must have been a lawful use in 1970, that's based on the assumption that the city

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

was a lawful use in 1982, that it must have been a lawful use in 1970, that's based on the assumption that the city was aware of what was going on and didn't take any action?

MR. TARLEY: I'm saying whatever happened in 1970 would be irrelevant if it was a lawful use in 1982.

I don't have to go back to '66. Just because it's an accessory use doesn't mean I have to use it that way.

MS. WHITE: Well, help me understand because you're relying on the fact that this is a nonconforming use, and when the ordinance changed in 1991,

you're maintaining it was a lawful use. But in order to prove that it was a lawful use at that point in time, don't you have to prove that it actually complied with the 1966 ordinance and the definition of nonconforming use which would mean the uninterrupted, no period for more than 24 months of uninterrupted use?

MR. TARLEY: Not from 1966 to 1991 or whenever the ordinance changed. You only have to prove the nonconforming consecutive period once it becomes nonconforming. I'm saying it was conforming in '82. When the ordinance changed, it was improper. You couldn't use it that way unless you had already established a use that was permitted under the prior ordinance.

It's sort of like a taking. The use that I had was proper. You've changed the ordinance making it improper. So long as I maintain — then it becomes a lawful nonconforming use. From that point forward, I have to continue that nonconforming use without any 24-month interruption. I don't need to go back. I only have to be sure — and what I'm saying, what I'm submitting to you with the leases and my presentation is that the proper use in 1982 was a single-family dwelling. Accessory use could be rented to roomers and boarders as set forth in the ordinance. And that's what the leases set forth, that it was used principally as a single-family dwelling as single

family is defined in that '66 ordinance and that it was rented to roomers. It then became nonconforming when the ordinance changed, and now we have to prove that there was no interruption.

MS. WHITE: I understand your point now and at least your position. Can you tell me if out of the leases that you've submitted, are there new leases that weren't submitted in preparation for the last hearing?

MR. TARLEY: Well, there were no leases provided at the last hearing. I guess maybe what you would -- there was a note I think in Ms. Murphy's letter that there were leases that were not provided at the time she was reviewing, and I think it was from 1993 to 2003. I have her letter here, but I believe that's what it was.

So there are leases in your packet from 1997, '98, '99, 2000 and 2001. The other leases as set forth in the affidavit, and that would be Tab 6 and Tab 7, the leases that are not there are not available for a variety of reasons as set forth in Mr. Andrews' affidavit. Furthermore, his practice was if the person stayed in the property at the end of the conclusion of the lease, they continued on a month-to-month basis and they did not enter into a separate written lease agreement.

MS. WHITE: Now, was this true for all three units? When I looked at the leases that were provided

in the package for the August meeting, I could not -- in making lists of occupancy based on the terms, there were lots of gaps. Now, when you look at these three units individually, can you say that for each one of the three units that they had uninterrupted use for each of those units, or are you just lumping them all together?

MR. TARLEY: Lumping them all together because they weren't -- Mr. Andrews, if you looked at the lease, has moved from one part of the dwelling to another part of the dwelling, leased one of the other areas, one of the other rooms or several of the other rooms. But during the entire period of time, all of the rooms were occupied either by the family living there, Mr. Andrews, or by boarders, roomers.

MS. WHITE: If they were occupied by the family, then that would have put him in compliance just with the 1991 ordinance changes, correct?

MR. TARLEY: It would depend upon to whom he rented. I'm saying Mr. Andrews was -- under the ordinance, the family provided for under the '66 ordinance, not that he was renting to family.

MS. WHITE: Under today, bringing you up to today, is there a family occupying this? I assume your position is that Units A and B are accessory uses. Am I understanding that correctly?

MR. TARLEY: Correct. 1 And what it would 2 be is that under the '66 ordinance and probably why the 3 ordinance was subsequently changed, family was more broadly 4 interpreted and it actually was a broader ordinance. 5 was one or more persons occupying the premises and living as 6 a single housekeeping unit as distinguished from a group 7 occupying the boarding house. The leases are with all three 8 people as a unit, not individuals. 9 MS. WHITE: Now, when I walked through 10 there today, my impression was that it was a boarding house. 11 I did not see anything in any shape or form that resembled a 12 family occupying the main house or the accessory houses. 13 Are you saying that that's no longer needed? 14 I submit that in the '66 MR. TARLEY: ordinance, family wasn't the traditional nuclear family. 15 16 It's defined only as one or more persons living together as 17 a housekeeping unit. And I think subsequently, the 18 ordinance was modified to make it more specific about what a 19 family is, related by blood. That was not in the '66 20 ordinance. And so I would submit that, yes -- and the term 21 boarding house is defined in the '66 ordinance. 22 submit that we're not part of that definition of what's 23 existing there now. That's all I have. 24 MS. WHITE: 25 MS. KNUDSON: Any other questions?

MR. KAFES: The photographs that you

passed out showing the condition of the property, apparently

looking at those photographs, the property was uninhabitable

or largely incapable of being used. For how long was the

building in that condition, and if it was more than two

years, it would break any period of -- or the allowance for

7 a nonconforming use.

MR. TARLEY: Are you asking a question?

MR. KAFES: Yeah. I guess my question is was the building uninhabitable as may have been indicated by these photographs, and if so, for what period? You may not know the answer to that.

MR. TARLEY: All I would have is the affidavit that Mr. Andrews provided. And I would submit to you that the photographs are in various stages of repair of the dwelling which showed some of the things that were uncovered when walls were removed.

MS. KNUDSON: Mr. Carr?

MR. CARR: In our package for the August 2nd meeting, we had an affidavit from Mr. Andrews stating that he first purchased the property known as 101 Chandler Court in 1984. From that time until 2004, the property was either owned or controlled by myself or a family member or a company controlled by myself or a family member. Somewhere I read in the package that I thought

```
Mr. Granger purchased the property in October of '02.
2
                      MR. TARLEY: No. Mr. Granger had written
3
   a letter I believe to Ms. Murphy inquiring about the use of
   that property in October of '02. The actual deed --
4
                                When did Mr. Granger purchase
5
                      MR. CARR:
6
   it?
7
                      MR. TARLEY:
                                   February of 2004.
8
                      MR. CARR:
                                 Thank you.
9
                      MS. KNUDSON: Any other questions for
10
   Mr. Tarley?
11
                                   I have a quick question for
                      MR. LAMSON:
   Mr. Tarley. On the building permits that were applied for
12
   by Mr. Granger, do you have the dates of when those were
13
    applied for?
14
                      MR. TARLEY:
                                   I do not.
15
                      MR. LAMSON:
                                   And what that paid for?
16
                      MR. TARLEY:
                                   I do not. If I could ask
17
    Mr. Granger?
18
                      MR. GRANGER:
                                     I think I have them with me
19
                           I will be happy to look.
20
    but I'm not positive.
                      MR. LAMSON:
                                   My generic question is were
21
22
    three building permits applied for and three building
    permits approved?
23
                      MR. TARLEY: I don't know the answer.
                                                              I'm
24
25
    going to wait for him.
```

MR. GRANGER: I do not have those with me.

MR. LAMSON: Mr. Granger, did you apply for three building permits that were approved?

MR. GRANGER: I applied for a number of different building permits for the various trades. When we installed -- when we replaced the meters, we had building permits to upgrade the electrical service so that each unit had its own 200 amp meter base and there are four heating and cooling systems. We pulled all the necessary permits, the subcontractors did and such. I'm not sure exactly how many were pulled, but I am confident that all the necessary permits were pulled.

MR. LAMSON: And my last question, were the majority of those permits pulled simultaneously or individually?

MR. GRANGER: Individually.

MS. MURPHY: I have the permits, copies of them. I have 101 Chandler Court, Building Permit 9402 which was issued to Gary Wallace for repairing moisture damaged bathrooms for 101 Chandler Court. I've got an electrical permit for 101-A Chandler Court, increase service to 300 amps and install circuits. I've got 101 Chandler Court, increase service to 300 amps. You've asked for dates also, didn't you? The building permit was June the 16th, 2004; the electrical permit was June the 15th, it looks like,

2004.

MS. KNUDSON: Are they all for different residences?

MS. MURPHY: There's an A and a B and a C on them. 101 Chandler Court, increase service to 200 amps with circuits, 6-17-2004; plumbing permit for 101 Chandler Court, replace 16 fixtures and three water heaters; mechanical permit for 101 Chandler Court, install four heat pumps and that was issued June 23rd. So that's what I have.

MS. KNUDSON: Thank you. Is there any other questions from the Board?

MS. WHITE: I'm going back to Mr. Andrews' affidavit that was submitted in connection with the August hearing, and he states that around 1992, there was a fire that destroyed some records, rental records stored different than had been supplied to Greg Granger. So this goes back to the question of the fire and how long that particular unit was out of use or units. You don't know the answer to

19 that?

MR. TARLEY: I have no answer other than what I have in my packet which are the leases that are through that period of time as well, '91 through '92, '92 to '93. So I would submit that the documentary trail establishes that there wasn't a two-year break, 24-month break.

MS. KNUDSON: Any other questions?

MR. KAFES: Mr. Tarley, are you saying now that the people that are inhabiting that building are roomers and not families?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. TARLEY: The use of the property can be as a single housekeeping unit -- and let's go back. The nonconforming use has been -- this request came up when Mr. Granger, Lone-G, purchased the property. At that time, the property had been used as a principal residence renting to roomers, nonconforming use, a lawful nonconforming use.

The property transferred hands February of 2004. Mr. Andrews continued to reside there until April of 2004 with the lease from Mr. Granger. Since then, it's been three separate units, one in the principal area of the residence living as a single housekeeping unit, and the other rented out to the boarders. What I submit to you, there are two decisions to make. Number one, that there was a lawful nonconforming use established by Mr. Andrews and all the entities that he controlled. Your second issue that I think you're going to is is this -- let's assume you're right: Mr. Tarley, is this a lawful nonconforming use. That's a separate question. Because you can answer the first one in the affirmative and the second one in the negative, but still there's been -- what I'm submitting to you is that there is a lawful nonconforming use that's been

established at that property for 25 years.

MR. CARR: The ordinance as I understand it with respect to rental of rooms to roomers permits it only in an owner-occupied dwelling. Now, this dwelling is not owner occupied.

MR. TARLEY: The current ordinance does.

The 1966 ordinance did not require that, and that's why this use would be conforming -- nonconforming, I'm sorry.

MS. WHITE: I actually have a question for him if that's okay. I've done a comparison while I was sitting here of the 1947 ordinance and the 1966 ordinance, and there is substantial difference in the definition of the accessory buildings or structures. And from 1947 to 1966, the difference is that in the 1947 ordinance, this is Section 23-10, subparagraph (2), Accessory uses and buildings, subparagraph (d), "Accessory buildings or structures located in the same lot with the residence such as a private garage, quarters for servants housed on the premises, noncommercial workshops, and living quarters for nonresidential use." That is actually contemplated in 1947. But when you get to the 1966 ordinance, they've taken that out.

So my question to you is that if you're going to rely completely on the 1966 ordinance, how do you reconcile the fact that that was taken out?

MR. TARLEY: There is actually an accessory buildings use in 26-9(a)(2)(D) on the '66 ordinance.

MS. WHITE: Correct. This is the one that says accessory buildings or structures located on the same lot with the residence such as a private garage, quarters for servants housed on the premises and noncommercial workshops.

MR. TARLEY: Right.

MS. WHITE: But it's taken out in the 1947 ordinance which said the accessory buildings or structures to have living quarters for residential use.

MR. TARLEY: Well, number one, we don't have an accessory building because this is all part of the same structure. Number two, it's the use of the premises. All I'm saying is if this was proper in the 1966 ordinance, it doesn't matter what the 1947 ordinance says. If it's a proper use in 1966, just like in 1991 -- or whatever use is proper in 1991, it doesn't matter what the '66 ordinance says. Just in the same fashion if this accessory use to the principal use -- the accessory use can't be the principal use. It's got to be accessory to the principal use. If it's proper by that 1966 ordinance and made improper by a subsequent ordinance provision, then it is a lawful nonconforming use.

1 MS. WHITE: So you're relying on your -and I'll need to get confirmation of this, if this is in 2 fact viewed as one building even though it's been permitted 3 as three different units by application. Now, I'm getting 4 confused a little bit in terms of what your position is. 5 6 Your position is that this is all one building not 7 withstanding the fact that you're leasing it out as three 8 separate units? And some of which -- I remember 9 Mr. Granger, when he took me through, one of the units you 10 couldn't actually access the main building from, you had to 11 walk outside and walk around. So you're --12 MR. TARLEY: I'm just using the definition of accessory building that's in the code which says any 13 building subordinate to the main building on a lot. 14 15 there is only one building. The difference between rental units and building I don't believe to be --16 17 MS. WHITE: Where I'm going is are you 18 trying to -- when you look at the 1966 ordinance, are you 19 relying on subparagraph (c) and not subparagraph (d)? 20 MR. TARLEY: Yes, (c) is the ordinance I 21 was just reviewing. (d) permits the construction of accessory buildings or structures, and (c) permits the 22 renting of rooms to residence boarders. 23 24 MS. WHITE: Okay. So your position is

25

1 MR. TARLEY: Yes. 2 MS. WHITE: Carolyn, is it viewed as one 3 building? 4 MS. MURPHY: I think I would say it's one 5 building. 6 MS. WORKMAN: The application that was 7 made to the zoning administrator, the question was whether or not the property could be divided into three separate 8 9 units. So the issue of whether this is a single-family dwelling and how many people can live in a single-family 10 dwelling is not one as I understand it that the zoning 11 administrator has made a decision about. 12 13 The question was whether this house as a legal nonconforming use could be divided into three separate 14 15 units. And based on the information that the zoning administrator has, the answer is it is not a legal 16 nonconforming use as the city sees it. 17 18 So that's what the -- the question that was in front of the zoning administrator, the question was 19 not if this is a single-family dwelling, are we 20 grandfathered for multiple people under the 1966 zoning 21 22 ordinance. That was not the question that Carolyn made a decision about.

MS. WHITE: So looking at (c) which says, "The renting of rooms and lodging and the serving of meals

23

24

25

for compensation to transient guests, residence boarders or 2 tourists by a member of the resident family or by an agent." 3 So the resident family in this particular case would be.... 4 MR. TARLEY: In establishing the 5 nonconforming use, because again, that's first where we're 6 going. 7 MS. WHITE: Well, I'm looking at the 8 1966 --9 MR. TARLEY: Oh, I know. I'm talking 10 about factually. The resident family to establish that nonconforming use since the ordinance changed was David 11 That's where you have to establish the 12 Andrews. nonconforming use, that it was in place prior to the zoning 13 So that was David Andrews as the resident family. 14 change. Any other questions? MS. KNUDSON: 15 (No audible response.) 16 MS. KNUDSON: Thank you, Mr. Tarley. 17 MR. TARLEY: Thank you. 18 MS. KNUDSON: I'll now, as I said before, 19 call the names first of the people who submitted slips, and 20 then if anyone else would like to speak, that will be fine. 21 Please when you get to the podium state your name and your 22 address for the record. 23 The first slip I have is Ruth Kaiser. 24 25 MS. KAISER: I'm so honored to be first.

I'm not a very good public speaker. My name is Ruth Kaiser.

I live at 609 Richmond Road. That makes me one of the city dinosaurs. I'm a homeowner. I live in my home. I think there are fewer and fewer of us every year which is why I'm here.

I missed the prior hearings on this issue, but it seems to me very succinctly that the city needs to make a precedent decision, and that is, rather than permitting facade neighborhoods that look like single-family dwellings like 101 Chandler Court, it's a lovely building from the outside -- and the reason it appeals to us is because it looks like a home. And the city owes those of us who reside there and pay our taxes to give us what we thought we already had and that was a small town with people who live here and work here.

The precedent is either to stretch the definition and thereby loosen parameters that are set in various ordinances or to tighten them and actually honor the spirit of the ordinances and the zoning. I don't want to move from my house. I've been here almost 25 years. I want to stay here.

And I'm not sure what we owe to a population that is not -- I'm not sure what we owe to a population that is not loyal to the city spirit. I feel like I'm threatened, and I would like for the city and those

who represent me as a homeowner to protect me and to serve me and to keep my neighborhood a neighborhood.

MS. KNUDSON: Thank you, Ms. Kaiser. The next slip is Mary Ann Brendel.

MS. BRENDEL: Good afternoon. I'm Mary Ann Brendel. Jack and I reside at 311 Burns Lane. I hope that I'm not going to be too simplistic, but I just need to make you understand that I have personally no bias against these college students. We moved to this town because of the college students. I think they add a great deal to our health and well-being. It's a lively community. But I think we need to strike a reasonable balance.

I will say at the outset that we have been renters when Jack was in law school. In fact, we rented one of our rooms to another law student. We've also been homeowners. We live in the corridor that is now being very much jeopardized by an overpopulation of students. And whereas in our neighborhood we welcome the proper use of single-family dwellings as rental space for students, I think we want to strike a happy balance.

I walk by 101 Chandler Court every morning of my life. I think what Greg has done has really been wonderful in terms of the aesthetics and the remodeling.

But I do think that the balance will be lost if we have nine students living in a house that was designed for a single

family.

So I hope you'll support the fact that we have been able in this town to hire professionals like Carolyn Murphy who is doing a superb job in my opinion and that we'll support the members of this Board who have been selected because of their expertise and their ability to see the total picture and because of their ability to see the vision for Williamsburg as we who have been here almost 50 years envision it. And I would urge you to stay the course. Thank you.

MS. KNUDSON: Thank you. Bill Dell.

MR. DELL: My name is Bill Dell and I live at 322 Indian Springs, and I think it's important that the people here in the audience as well as this Board understand a little bit of the background. I know a little bit more about this particular case than most simply because of my job as the liaison between the neighborhood council and Williamsbug City.

Back in October of 2002, Ms. Murphy, you know, sent the letter talking about this particular property would not be able to be used other than a single-family residence. When Lone-G purchased the property in April of 2004, they were again notified before any renovations were made that the same was the case.

The city was told by the new owner that

they had incontrovertible proof that the nonconformance would apply. However, that proof up to that particular point in time had not been provided to city and as I understand still has not been provided to the city. And unfortunately, I'm not privy to the entire package that's been presented to the Board, but I haven't heard of anything that is new that has been generated since the last meeting when it was postponed.

In April of '05, one year after the owner was told that this was not a nonconforming property, a letter was sent to the individual which the individual refused to accept because it was sent certified mail, return receipt requested. And it was I believe through my request and my asking of the city had they -- actually, what I did, I called Carolyn and I asked her if the individual had rebutted her letter that she had sent. And she says, well, you know, I've been out of the office and I'll have to check and just make sure that he even received that particular letter.

Well, come to find out, he had refused it. It had not been received. So that put the onus on the city to send a special courier to deliver the letter to Lone-G or Lone-G's representatives when they acknowledged it, so this is the first time that they actually acknowledged the fact that the city had sent the letter which of course

incorporated yet another month's delay in the process.

Then, of course, as you know, last month the appeal was finally made to the Board and again it was requested that the issue be tabled which incurred another 30-day delay or thereabouts. And as we stand today, from the time that the property was purchased not to mention the two years prior when it was discussed that that particular piece of property was not to be anything other than a single family, we have still no proof of nonconformance.

So I'm just a country boy from Arkansas, and it would seem that, you know, in these areas where we have no particular proof, i.e., a lease or otherwise, that I would submit that it's quite possible they don't exist and never have existed.

The other thing is that I would like to say that, you know, according to the federal income tax regulations, that anyone that is renting a piece of property has to report that property or report the income from that property on their federal income tax returns. So it would seem to me one of the easiest ways to resolve this situation would be for this Board to ask to see those income tax reports that show that in fact those particular pieces of property or those rooms were rented over those particular periods of time.

So not withstanding all of that, I would

urge that this Board deny the appeal because in my mind, you know, the questions of the legitimacy of our strategic plan, of our comprehensive plan, of our Architectural Review Board, of the city zoning is all contingent upon what you members of the Board decide today. Because as one of the previous speakers so beautifully stated, there are those of us that have come to this city and we have bought property in the inner city fully expecting that property to maintain its value and not be invaded and have those neighborhoods deteriorate by absentee landlords that come in and don't take care of their property. It's an injustice and even more importantly it's a direct violation of the city ordinances. And I would urge you to please deny this appeal.

And I will be the first to admit that the property looks a thousand percent better today than it did several months ago, but I also, as one who walks by that property every day when I go out on my walks, I'll also assure you that if you look at the property today, it looks a lot worse than it did particularly with regards to the landscaping than it did a month and a half ago. The lawn is, although admittedly sodded, it is full of weeds and there are puddles of water all through it. And I would maintain that the property is going to continue to deteriorate because the students aren't going to take care

of it unless some other arrangements are made. Again, please deny this particular request.

MS. KNUDSON: Thank you.

MR. DELL: I regret it, but I have to leave for another meeting, and I look forward to hearing your resolution.

MS. KNUDSON: Victor Smith?

MR. SMITH: Thank you for the opportunity.

I'm Victor Smith. I live at 140 Chandler Court. I also support Carolyn's efforts to keep neighborhoods neighborhoods with people living in them rather than turning them into dormitories.

I think that Mr. Tarley has misrepresented the neighbors' intentions by the way he has used words and cast shadows on our objections by creating issues that don't really exist. Most of us do not have problems with the fact that we have students, most of us don't object to having reasonable rentals in neighborhoods, and most of us have recognized that Mr. Andrews rented his home when he was living in his home, owning his home and then renting it to some other people, and that was not something we objected to. There were condition issues and other things that we had problems with, but not that.

So I think to run us around other kinds of issues and talk legalism about things that have been made

into matters of law -- because laws are things that are there to protect people. This is one of those areas where laws have been written in order to serve a purpose. In our case, I hope part of that purpose is to understand what a neighborhood means and that it's not a rooming house or it's not something else. And whether you have somebody defining it because somebody's language changed or maybe perhaps inadvertently left out something and then have somebody make a wonderful statement of why we messed up on words to be able to stuff nine people into a single-family dwelling I think is atrocious and violates the spirit of neighborhoods and the community and whatever.

And so anything that you all as city fathers and mothers can do and your people who we elect to help protect us as our neighbor has said, I hope you do that. I don't see this house as having -- you know, maybe I'm wrong, students, but are you a family unit? Do you consider yourselves a family unit? I think perhaps your parents might be interested if you -- if they were reporting that you were all living together as a family unit.

I understand why the rules may have changed because we have issues of gay people living together as in fact a family unit or whatever, and that is a theological thing I don't want to get into, but I don't think that renting to three students constitutes a family

unit. And then who is renting what house to what. And then all of a sudden, all we have is packing Volkswagens in my era. That's not something you want to drive down the street every day. The fact that you can do it is one issue. The fact that it's right to do it and drive around and use that as the new definition for what a Volkswagen car is is a whole different thing. And I think that's part of the problem.

I would like to invite anybody here who happens to be a neighbor, if I may, to for the record at least show whether they are here in opposition to having nine people, not whether it is a rental and not whether it is conforming or nonconforming which is the technical issue that you-all are going to worry about, but whether we as a neighborhood have a problem with nine nonrelated individuals in one building.

(Audience members indicated.)

MR. SMITH: Do you want a count of this?
Okay. May the record show that almost everybody except for the people that are parties in this thing don't like this.
And I think one of the reasons that we have hearings for these purposes is so that the neighbors can express their opinions and hopefully be listened to by the city that's trying to take care of them. (Indicated.) Thank you very much.

MR. KAFES: May I say something? I believe Mr. Smith commented to the effect that we were elected officials?

MR. SMITH: Not you, but the city.

MR. KAFES: I just want to make it clear, we are not, we are not elected officials. We serve without compensation.

MR. SMITH: You are part of an electoral process that is designed with ancillary functions such as yourselves to be able to take care of business in the city and make rules that enhance and whatever it is. You can fiddle with the language.

MS. KNUDSON: John Owens.

MR. OWENS: Madam Chair, I've already written you and I spoke last time, so I will not repeat myself. I will say without regard to the issue of continued occupancy of all three units, it will come as a surprise and did come as a surprise to those of who us who have lived in Chandler Court to learn that such was the case.

Now, I do hope that the Board will review very, very carefully whatever evidence exists for that continued occupancy and I hope, too, that it will consider the suggestion that Mr. Dell made with regard to federal income tax records. Having been a property owner and a property renter myself, my taxes also contain appreciation

scales for the properties in question which provide a very useful index to the issue of continued occupancy.

So without attempting to tell the Board its business, I will say and I'm sure that I can speak for my neighbors, I know that I speak for my neighbors in expressing our confidence that you will decide this matter on the basis of the law, we can't ask for more than that, the letter of the law and most certainly the spirit of the law as we know it today. Thanks.

MS. KNUDSON: Gary Shelly.

MR. SHELLY: I am Gary Shelly. I live at 205 Indian Springs. I own the house at 100 Chandler Court which is directly across the street from 101. I have quite a few things to say. Our home at 100 Chandler Court is the one most impacted by 101 Chandler Court.

Before I get too much further, I would like say that nobody likes to be caught in the middle of disputes like this, and I have friends on both sides. We lived in the house on Chandler Court in 1997 through the middle of 1993, and we were friends with everybody, liked them, respected them, and continue to do so to this day.

I've learned, however, first about the house being a three rental unit -- a three-dwelling unit back in the early '90s. I own a house on Madison Road in James City County, and one of the residents that used to

live at 101 Chandler Court moved out of that place and moved into my house. And at that time, I learned that it had, according to her, two others. As a resident at 100 Chandler Court, I, on quite a few occasions, was requesting and have requested the tenants living particularly in the back apartment to do minor repairs (inaudible) a toilet, a fuse box, or one time I had to go to her house to clear a drain. But the apartment in back was seemingly mostly occupied.

Now, my relationship with Dave as a neighbor was quite good. Dave was friendly to me. He kept to himself. And, indeed, I never once set foot inside of his particular unit. Nonetheless, we were on very friendly terms as we are today in spite of the differences we had, differences over the students.

Some of you may know I've been quite active with students in the past couple of years in particular in trying to get them to get involved in their process here, and it's important that we think about what Dick had to say about how we have our system set up here with a system in place and ancillary functions. And you-all are to be commended and have our appreciation for taking your time to (inaudible).

The fact of the matter remains that students are not allowed to sit on this Board, are not allowed to be members of city council. And it's so

important. We also, while we appreciate what you do for our town, without them, we wouldn't have the town we have. And we can go on and on and list the wonderful things they provide to us, and yet we don't turn around and give them the consideration and the respect they deserve. And they cannot get it for themselves because don't have the right to vote. So they depend upon people like you-all to look out for their best interest.

And we have nine students who are many of desperate, desperate large numbers over at the college looking for places downtown within walking distance who would just love to have that house to live in. And while the quality may not appeal to how some of us may like to live our lives, it is nonetheless their domain right by the college.

I feel very fortunate living with Bill Dell on the street that I do with my new family. And we're not overwhelmed perhaps is the word that some people like to say with college students. But should that occurrence ever happen, we will be prepared to deal with it because they have the right to be here in my estimation.

Living in Chandler Court was a fine experience. And as I said, we had good relations with everybody. No one likes to be caught in the middle. On Chandler Court, we had our internal problems and we pretty

much tried to keep them to ourselves, but not always. Once upon a time maybe four or five years ago, I received a very strongly written word from Channing Hall who was representing another owner, and it had to do with a problem up the street. And so be it, neighbors have problems. It happens. These neighbors as I see today I believe -- I'm not exactly sure who the principals were in it, in this problem, but I believe also if given time, it's able to be worked out.

Regarding 101 Chandler Court, we've all said before and we've all noticed, I will commend

Mr. Granger on the wonderful job he's done. (Inaudible.)

This came from The Virginia Gazette, the front page of The

Virginia Gazette in 1995 talking about the house. Certainly

as I lived in Chandler Court, it was a main issue to have

the house cleaned up for a lot of the residents.

But I would like to say as the owner of the house, and my wife agrees with me, that is most impacted -- one more thing I would like to say before I -- I was about to say that we support the efforts of Mr. Granger. We certainly approve of how he's handled the house. We would hope that the people -- we would like to try to work this thing out. I don't know specifically all the problems, but parking is a major issue. And we haven't really given Mr. Granger a chance to work on that. These things happen.

Anything we've asked of him so far, he has done. And as far as I can tell, he's running a fairly tight ship, very tight ship over there, and I think we're all pleased with how the neighborhood looks when we drive by his house.

I would like to say, too, although I'm not living across from it now, when we first moved into Chandler Court, the house next door that is now occupied by our very, very good friends, the Quarles, was a house not dissimilar to the situation that is at 101 now.

much enjoy our friendship with the Quarles, I also personally had no problem living with the students right next to me. Sure, our car was boxed in sometimes. And sure, there may have been some more noise than the Quarles made, but that's part of the price you pay and the many wonderful things you get in return. Thank you very much.

MS. KNUDSON: That's all the slips I have.

Is there anyone else that would like to speak?

MR. GODDIN: Hi, my name is Stewart

Goddin. I'm at 715 Goodwin Street here in the city. Just a couple of real quick comments. I'm not a lawyer, but as I understood the argument made by Lone-G's lawyer was that if a property has any legal nonconforming use, that automatically means that they can do anything else which is not conforming. So if there's a B and B in town which has

six units legally because it's nonconforming but it had them before they changed the law to four, they can now go to twelve because they had six. And it was legally nonconforming at one time -- I mean, it's legally allowed for what they had, but if you have anything that's legal now as nonconforming, that you automatically can do anything else you want. And this seems to be how we're making the jump from a single-family home to a triplex. And why not a four-unit apartment in there? Why not six apartments in there?

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: It doesn't have a full basement.

MR. GODDIN: So there is a limit there.

And the other thing which -- you know, I also admire the house at 101 Chandler Court which looks better, but that's not the issue here at all. I mean, I don't think we want to get into a situation as a city that if someone comes in and spends lots of money, cleans the place up and now says, well, let's don't have a single-family home, let's make it a townhouse or let's make it a condo, let's make it an apartment building because I cleaned it up and put a lot of money in it. That was my only comments. Thank you.

MS. KNUDSON: Thank you. Yes, sir?

MR. GEARY: My name is Bill Geary. I'm at

601 Wythe Lane. I will join the parade of people

complimenting Mr. Granger on the marvelous house transition on the property. We on Chandler Court have been very keen on playing by the rules, and I see this basically as an issue of what are the rules and are our people playing by the rules. And zoning is so important to our town, and the precedent is so important. And I confess, I'm very confused about the presentation this afternoon because I'm not sure what the issues are.

For example, Mr. Andrews sold the property into different forms of ownership. Does that mean then that he wasn't in fact the person who owned the property continuously? Did he become a tenant in the property as a result of those transfers? I'm certainly not a legal -- I'm not a lawyer. I'm not prepared to assess the legal issues. And then the corroboration of Mr. Andrews' contentions about renting the property and supplying tax returns seems to be part of a good case.

But I think mainly it's about playing by the rules. So we have a house that's owned by a superintendent of schools and rented out, and he knows that if he puts four students in there, that he's going to hear from all the neighbors because right now the rule is three. Maybe the rule should be seven. You know, I don't know that it's about liking students or not liking students or wanting them. Of course we want them or we wouldn't be there. We

wouldn't be in this town. We wouldn't be on Chandler Court.
But it's about what the rules are.

So when I heard the presentation today, I thought I heard that it was one house which would mean that there would be one family who would have roomers. And so that really the argument is about head count. And I heard Mr. Tarley say you could say yes to this and no to that. And so he was making some important distinctions about what the real issue is. Is the issue that those three apartments are grandfathered because you can trace the history of each one and that this in fact a three-apartment dwelling and that it's always been a three-apartment dwelling, or is it instead that it's somebody's house and that somebody has sold it into different organizations and bought it back and forth but it's somebody's house and that person as I, as an owner, would like to have students in my house?

So is it about it's somebody's house and that somebody could be three people and then they could rent rooms to -- they could rent two rooms and they could rent to two other people and we get the number seven? Now, it seems to me whatever -- the discussion I heard from Mr. Tarley had nothing to do with what I thought the issue was which I heard you speak to earlier which is are we looking at a three flat? Do we have on Chandler Court a building that has been maintained continuously as a three flat? It may

look to everybody like a house. If we do, then I accept the fact that it should have nine people in it because that's the way the rules are.

critical legal issues. It doesn't matter what I like or what I don't like. Obviously it affects me as a property owner on Chandler Court. If everybody is packing their house with nine students, then I want to say, okay, I will be a fraternity too. So the rules are really important, and I would respect your experience and certainly all the work that it will take to ascertain whether or not the case has been made that we have a three flat here. Thank you.

MS. KNUDSON: Thank you, Mr. Geary. Is there anyone else? Yes, sir?

MR. BARSHIS: My name is Darr Barshis. I live at 17 Forest Hill Drive. And I wasn't planning on speaking here today, but certainly all of us who moved to this town and especially those on Jamestown Road and Richmond Road noticed those large buildings across the street. They comprise the College of William and Mary.

Many of the properties in this town are nonconforming use properties and were built specifically for rental to students, to those college students. I own some of those properties. These nonconforming use properties are purchased by investors to rent to tenants. That is not

going to change unless the planning commission makes changes to our zoning ordinances. There is no surprise to the neighbors here that this property has been used for tenant occupants over decades, no surprise at all.

The rules that you-all have to decide on are clear. I believe Mr. Tarley has laid out very clearly and provided evidence that this residence was a legally conforming use prior to a zoning change and that made it a legally nonconforming use property.

Lastly, I would just like to say that tenants are not terrorists, nor are students. Oftentimes, this is the first time -- a student, when a student moves into a rental property in the neighborhood, it's their first time in a neighborhood. Neighbors help neighbors become good neighbors. All too often I believe people come to government bodies like this saying change the rules and get these tenants out of our neighborhood for us. That's not your job here today. Your job is to stick by the rules. Thank you.

would like to speak? Yes, sir?

MR. THOMPSON: Good afternoon. My name is Alex Thompson, and I'm one of the three members on the lease. I consider Williamsburg my home. This is my first legal residence, and I have changed where I'm a registered

voter. I'm a registered voter in the city of Williamsburg.

And I invite anyone on Chandler Court or anyone who happens
to walk by the house to stop and talk to us. You know, like
the previous gentleman just said, we're not terrorists.

Yes, this is our first time kind of being out in the world. And certainly as everyone has said, the property looks remarkably better than it was. And I invite anyone to come in as well. The inside of the house is fantastic. We all love living there.

and the issue has been raised whether or not we are viewed as a family. And I would say that, yes, we are. We're certainly not your traditional family. We're not related. But this is primarily occupied by members of the William and Mary sailing team. We practice together. We live together. We eat together. Everything we do revolves around one another. And we -- among other things, where we sail out of, First Colony, we put on a sailing program over the summer. We have barbecues with their residents. We like to be part of the community. And that is said for every student in William and Mary. We like to go out in the community because this is our home as well.

And the issue has been raised whether or not we're permanent residents. While it's true that we're only here for four years, maybe a few more, we do live here and we care about this city. And we do everything we can to

put something back to it. And so if anyone has any issues with 101 Chandler Court, please come to us. We'll be happy to take care of it.

People are talking about the number of cars that we're trying to pack into a small space. Well, Mr. Granger has made a parking lot for four cars. You can't fit any more in there, and we keep a very rigid schedule so that we only have those four. If there is any more, please come to us, we'll get it moved.

Now, last year, we had a problem with our parking lot being used as a temporary parking lot for people who were visiting the college. We don't know who owns the cars and oftentimes we wouldn't be able to catch them and let them know that it's a private parking lot. But we would do our best. We would leave notes and police the best we could.

But my main point is that we are members of the city of Williamsburg. I'm a registered voter, and I care about the city. And I would like anyone to come to us if they have any problems, and we'll do our best to make it seem like this is a neighborhood and that we're all neighbors. Thank you.

MS. KNUDSON: Thank you very much. Would anyone else like to speak?

(No audible response.)

hearing. I would like to mention for the record that all five members of the Board visited the property this afternoon and had a tour inside and outside. What are the wishes of the Board? Ms. White or Mr. Kafes?

MS. WHITE: I will yield to the floor.

MR. KAFES: I'll have to say, I'm confused on a number of levels. First of all, we were given some documentary evidence at the meeting. Under our rules, they should be received at least three days prior to the meeting, so none of us have really had an adequate opportunity to review them. That's one problem I have.

Also, with all due respect to Mr. Tarley, I'm not sure I really followed his argument. And in order for us to go forward, I wonder whether it might be appropriate for the Board to defer making a decision until such time as we've had an opportunity to study the material that's been presented to us today. And also, I question whether it would be appropriate to ask Mr. Tarley to spell out his position in a further memorandum which will allow us to study it. Based on what I've been given today, I'm really lost to be honest with you. May I ask, you quoted from some of the early ordinances. Was that -- where did that come from?

MS. WHITE: It came out of the materials

that Ms. Murphy put in our packages for the August hearing.

MR. KNUDSON: Mr. Carr?

MR. CARR: Thank you. As Mr. Kafes said, we were given this package of information this afternoon, so while the speakers were talking, I was trying to listen to them but also going through these leases. And just as an observation, several of these leases are either unsigned or have no automatic extensions. And so while at the top of them they may say from -- I have one here, 7-92 to 5-95, the date -- the expiration date of the lease is June 30th, I think, '93. So my point in bringing this up, and I've dog tagged several of them, and it looks like it's about seven or them or so, I don't know if I could follow the trail of this property being leased properly without any breaks. And, again, some of the leases are not signed, and we don't have these renewals. So I've just got some questions there, okay, is one observation.

The other I will get into a little bit later about how Ms. Murphy, what she shared with us in the August 2nd hearing, her reasons for her letter, and I think they're pretty much straightforward. But I do have concern about these leases.

MS. KNUDSON: Ms. White?

MS. WHITE: And I'll just say that unless you-all convince me otherwise, I'm prepared today to make a

decision. And, Mr. Kafes, your question about the fact that we got all of these materials, I agree with you, under normal circumstances, I would want to -- obviously as a lawyer, I would want to dig into them and try to compare them against the materials that we had previously.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

However, I did put a question to Mr. Tarley, and that was could he definitively tell this Board that there has been no uninterrupted use of all three units for the period of time, and he said he could not. then that's I believe where we got into -- or he got into the discussion about if the use was nonconforming generally, then it didn't matter about the other units. And I would say that for the purpose of today's hearing which is to determine whether the zoning administrator erred in issuing her letter of April 26th concerning whether or not the three units are nonconforming uses and her conclusion in that letter, that obviously the burden of proof both under our ordinance and as acknowledged by Mr. Tarley is on the Applicant to show us that they have met that burden. nothing in Mr. Tarley's presentation today could tell us definitively that there were no uninterrupted periods of time for all three of those units.

We also don't know what happened between 1966 and 1984. And there is a question in my mind as to whether his argument that that's irrelevant is truly

irrelevant since the property has been constructed since 1925 at least. So I am ready to make a decision, and I'll go through my rationale if appropriate.

MS. KNUDSON: Mr. Lamson?

MR. LAMSON: I have several questions.

First, I know this is a very delicate issue in trying to find some kind of consensus. I want to ask Carolyn and Chris if the Applicant, based on the decision of this Board, decided to file a variance that would perhaps meet some community consensus where perhaps they were to file a variance requesting the use of two units and six occupants on the property and four cars, is that something the Applicant could then do if the Board decided against this appeal?

wariance at any point in time that they choose for whatever condition that they feel the variance is appropriate for, something that is modifying the zoning ordinance. But the standard that they have to meet in order for this Board to grant a variance is essentially that they have lost all economic value of the property, and if the Board doesn't act, it's essentially a taking. And that is an incredibly high standard for the Applicant to have to meet. Having said that, the Applicant can certainly file for a variance.

MR. LAMSON: So that if I were to believe

that the property met a legal nonconforming use and yet I did not want to set a precedent with this decision but wanted to see perhaps a variance that would bring to the table more of a consensus direction in the neighborhood and was willing to support that, that is something that the Applicant could do then, correct?

MS. WORKMAN: All right. I'm a little bit confused because as I understood your question, you were linking today's hearing with the request for a variance, and they are two separate and distinct issues. The question on the table today is did Carolyn err in her decision with respect to the property in that there is no legal nonconforming use insofar as this property has three units. If you make a determination one way or the other on that issue, it is not -- it doesn't have anything to do with a subsequent request for a variance.

MR. LAMSON: All right. Let me restate my question, and I apologize. If I believe that the Applicant proved it was a legal nonconforming use today and yet the appeal did not succeed, and in the sense of the community spirit of building a consensus to meet some middle ground and not to establish nine residents and three units there for the history of that property but in fact reducing it in a variance where it would become two units, for example, with six occupants and four cars and limiting conditions on

that property, i.e, with a resale --

MR. KAFES: It's my understanding that a variance is not available as to questions of use. That's what he's talking about.

MS. WORKMAN: Right.

MS. WHITE: Well, the other option would be to apply for rezoning of the property. And certainly any number of options would have been available to the Applicant at the time they purchased. They wrote to Ms. Murphy in 2002 but didn't close until 2004. Now, I'm not sure why that delay, but typically you wouldn't close on a piece of property unless you knew that you could use it for the purposes intended.

MS. KNUDSON: I'd just like to say that I, too, am opposed to a deferral at this point. I think this matter has already been deferred once, and I don't really think we ought to put it off anymore. I think the zoning administrator has made a very cogent argument. I do not think that the Applicant has made an especially cogent argument in asking for a reversal of her decision. I just thought I would say that. Would anyone care to make a motion?

MS. WHITE: I would like to -- well, we're
going to have discussion after the motion?

MS. KNUDSON: Yes.

1 MS. WHITE: I would like to move to uphold 2 the decision of the zoning administrator. 3 MS. KNUDSON: Is there a second to that motion? 4 5 MR. KAFES: Our rules require that there 6 be a statement of the reasons in an appeal. So your resolution would need to include a statement. 7 MS. WHITE: I believe we had a form 8 9 resolution in our packet, and I would move that we adopt the form resolution. Would you like me to go through and read 10 11 the specific reasons? 12 MR. CARR: It was not in the second 13 package. It must have come from the first package, but it 14 may be the second resolution. 15 MS. KNUDSON: Carolyn, can you help with that? 16 17 MS. MURPHY: Yeah. 18 MS. WHITE: While this was part of the publicly available package for the August hearings, since 19 20 some of these who weren't present might not have been privy 21 to that, there are some statements of findings in the 22 resolution that was in the packet. Let me make sure I'm 23 reading them correct. "That as of 1966 and at all times 24 25 thereafter, the zoning laws of the city of Williamsburg

limited the use and occupancy of the subject property to single-family dwelling purposes; that while prior to 1966, the zoning laws of the city of Williamsburg did allow two-family dwelling usage of the property, there is no evidence that such property was used for anything other than a single-family dwelling and that in 1966 when the property was rezoned to limit its use to single-family dwelling purposes, the property was being used and occupied as a single-family dwelling; that the city's permit records from 1950 to present do not indicate any legal change in the use of property from the single-family dwelling; that copies of leases provided by the Appellant fail to establish that the property was ever legally used and occupied as a two-family dwelling while the city's zoning ordinance allowed such use; that the Appellant bears the burden of proof to establish valid nonconforming use status of the property. That the Appellant has failed to show by a preponderance of the evidence that the property enjoys a legal nonconforming use status that would allow its use and occupancy for any purpose other than the uses allowed in the city's RS-2 single-family dwelling district which uses do not include multifamily dwellings." Those would be the reasons. Is there a second to the MS. KNUDSON: motion?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KAFES: I'll second it.

MS. KNUDSON: Is there discussion?

there's been a lot of discussion in front of us today. My rationale, what I think we're here for today, we're here on the limited question of whether the zoning administrator erred in her conclusion that the use of this property for three residential dwelling units did not legally meet the criteria as a nonconforming use under our zoning ordinance.

Now, this Board is a quasi-judicial body which means that we're not elected. We're not supposed to play politics. I know whichever way we go, some of you would walk out today and say, ah, you know, it was political. But our job is to try to apply the law to the facts as best we can.

As I've stated earlier tonight, the
Applicant has the burden to bear to prove to this Board that
these units were used historically as nonconforming uses and
meet the legal criteria that's set forth in our ordinance.
Based on the evidence that's been submitted and the
presentation by Mr. Tarley, I have found that the evidence
is insufficient to establish a nonconforming use. The
current use does also not comply with the current ordinance.

The students here obviously are faced with some real issues that are living in this particular arrangement. And I feel for them, I really do. I was a

William and Mary undergrad student. I was a William and Mary law student. I know what it's like to scrounge around and look for places to live. I know that the Applicant has in other instances supplied college housing, and I think that's not a bad position to be in. I think it's a noble position.

However, we have to apply the law, and we have to play by the rules. The record reflects that the Applicant was told in 2002 prior to the actual purchase of this property that it could only be used as a single-family dwelling, and there was no application to this Board for a variance. There was no application to my knowledge to city council for rezoning. The Applicant for whatever reasons went ahead forward with the purchase in 2004.

We, as the Board of Zoning Appeals, can't change the ordinance or the zoning that's applicable to this particular property. The only body that can change that ordinance is the city council. And in this particular case, I find that the Applicant simply has not met its burden of proof sufficient to justify this qualifying as a nonconforming use.

MS. KNUDSON: Thank you. Mr. Carr?

MR. CARR: I share several of the sentiments that Ms. White just expressed and feel that our overturning the zoning administrator's decision a very high

standard, very high standard, and I don't think that standard has been reached today.

I've got concerns about the leases. I've already mentioned that several of them were not fully executed and the maturity dates of many of them are of question. Also, I don't think we have copies, I may be wrong, but I don't think we have copies of the leases for the current students in the property, so I don't know if -- you know, by technical standards, is it leased or not. So it would be helpful to have had those leases perhaps.

But, again, I think the burden is so high for the Applicant to show that the zoning administrator's decision is wrong that I will support the motion.

MS. KNUDSON: Mr. Lamson?

MR. LAMSON: Well, and, again, I know it's a very emotional issue, but I think when it comes down to the literal sense of it, that I think the zoning administrator did not err on the part of interpreting the zoning requirement.

My greater concern which we unfortunately have no jurisdiction over is the consensus in the community and the building and how that takes place and whether that takes place through a variance on this Board or with a zoning change with the city council. And however that is done procedurally, I think that is the direction that I

would encourage. But in light of that, I have to support the zoning administrator.

MS. KNUDSON: Mr. Kafes?

MR. KAFES: I think Ms. White has stated the whole situation extremely well, and I agree with what she has said. My suggestion that we defer for another month is really just an attempt to perhaps give the Applicant -- the Appellant every consideration, but I think we've already done that really.

But I would also like to add that the fact that there was evidence submitted by some of the people who testified here with respect to these, Jennifer Quarles at the August 2nd, a resident for the last five years stated that she had not seen evidence of the kind of use that's now being claimed for the property during that period, and Victor Smith who also testified on August 2nd, a 17- or 18-year resident stated the same thing. So we also have that evidence on the record as far as our consideration.

But there's been some suggestion that, well, this has gone on for a long time and therefore that it makes it legal. It doesn't make it legal at all. It's a rule of law that there's no estoppel against the sovereign, the sovereign in this case being the city. In other words, the fact that the city may not have enforced the zoning code does not preclude it from enforcing it at some later date.

1 It's also the case with respect to this type of situation that it's very, very difficult sometimes 2 to enforce the zoning code. It's come to the question of 3 how many people are occupying the property. The zoning 5 administrator can't go around in the middle of the night doing a bed check to find out how many people are in a 6 particular residence. So that's nothing that should be 7 8 considered by us and of course was not considered by us. 9 Finally, I would second what Ms. White 10 said with respect to the expertise of the zoning 11 administrator. An appeal of this type, an administrative 12 appeal, we can only overturn the decision of the Administrator if we find there is manifest error and there 13 14 is no manifest error here. And also, we need to give due deference to the expertise of the Administrator, and there 15 is no question in my mind of the expertise that's available 16 here from Carolyn Murphy. So for all of these reasons, I 17 18 second the motion and I support it. 19 MS. KNUDSON: Thank you. I, too, support 20 the motion for all the reasons that have been said. getting late and we don't need to go into them. 21 So is there 22 any further discussion? 23 (No audible response.) 24 MS. KNUDSON: Would you call the roll, 25 please?

1	MS. SCOTT: Mr. Kafes?
2	MR. KAFES: Aye
3	Ms. SCOTT: Mr. Lamson?
4	MR. LAMSON: Aye.
5	MS. SCOTT: Mr. Carr?
6	MR. CARR: Aye.
7	MS. SCOTT: Ms. Knudson?
8	MS. KNUDSON: Aye?
9	MS. SCOTT: Ms. White?
10	MS. WHITE: Aye.
11	MS. KNUDSON: The motion is to uphold the
12	decision of the zoning administrator. Thank you.
13	
14	000
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
6	CITY OF WILLIAMSBURG, to-wit:
7	
8	I, Brenda Lewis Caputo, CCR, do certify
9	that the foregoing pages are a true and accurate transcript
10	of the proceedings had at the time and place mentioned and
11	transcribed to the best of my ability.
12	This 3rd day of October, 2005.
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	Brenda Lewis Caputo, CCR Court Reporter
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	My commission expires September 30, 2009.
	1

102 15:1,4
'05 27:9 '66 2:24; 6:19; 7:19;
9:21; 11:1; 12:20; 13:2,
14,19,21; 20:2,19 '82 8:12; 10:10
'90s 34:24
'91 17:22 '92 17:22
'93 17:23; 47:11 '98 11:16
199 11:16
~ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
- 2:1,4 00 1:13.5;
59:14
1
1 4:8,12; 5:9
100 34:12,14; 35:3 101 2:14,18; 14:21; 16:18,
101 2:14,18; 14:21; 16:18,
20,22; 17:5,6,8; 24:10; 25:21; 34:13,15; 35:1; 37:10; 38:9; 39:15; 45:2
37:10; 38:9; 39:15; 45:2 101-A 16:21
131 4:18
134 4:15,18 140 4:18; 30:9
15th 16:25 16 17:7
16th 16:24
17 42:16 17- 57:16
18-year 57:17
1925 49:2 1947 9:3,4; 19:11,13,14,
20; 20:10,17
1950 53:10 1966 2:19; 8:12,16; 9:2,6, 8,10; 10:3,7; 19:7,11,13,
8,10; 10:3,7; 19:7,11,13, 21,24; 20:16,18,23;
21:18: 22:21: 23:8:
48:24; 52:24; 53:2,6 1970 9:17,20
1979 3:2; 5:14
1982 8:8,11,15; 9:9,16,20; 10:22
1984 14:22; 48:24 1991 5:8; 7:13; 9:25;
10:7: 12:17: 20:18.19
1992 17:14 1993 11:13; 34:20
1995 37:14
1997 11:16; 34:19
2
2 5:12,21; 8:8; 19:15;
20:2 200 16:8; 17:5
2000 11:16
2001 11:16 2002 26:19; 51:10; 55:9
2003 11:13
2004 3:22; 5:18; 14:22:
15:7; 16:24; 17:1; 18:12, 13; 26:23; 51:10; 55:14
2005 1:7.5; 60:12 2009 60:25
205 34:12 207 4:18
23-10 19:15
·

```
23185 1:10.5
 23rd 17:9
 24 2:21; 6:21; 7:6,22;
  10:5
 24-month 10:18; 17:24
 25 5:23; 7:10; 19:1; 24:20
 26 7:1
 26-9 2:23; 5:9,12; 7:19;
  20:2
 26th 48:15
 2nd 14:20; 47:20; 57:13,16
            3
 P
 3 5:23
 30 60:25
 30-day 28:5
 300 16:21,23
 30th 47:10
 311 25:6
 322 26:13
 3rd 60:12
 401 1:10
 4:00 1:8
 -----
            5
 5-95 47:9
 50 26:8
 6
 6 1:7,5; 11:17
 6-17-2004 17:6
 601 39:25
 609 24:2
 7 11:17
 7-92 47:9
 706 4:14
 715 38:20
 -----
            8
 8 5:24
          9
 9402 16:18
  ------
        A
 ability 26:6,7; 60:11
 able 8:5; 26:3,21; 31:10; 33:10; 37:8; 45:13
 absentee 29:10
 accept 27:12; 42:1
 access 21:10
 accessory 2:25; 3:4; 5:12,
17; 6:25; 7:2,11; 9:22;
10:22; 12:24; 13:12;
19:13,15,16; 20:2,5,11,
14,20,21,22; 21:13,22
 according 28:16; 35:3
 accurate 5:1: 60:9
 acknowledge 8:25
 acknowledged 27:23,24;
  48:18
 across 34:13; 38:6; 42:19
 act 49:22
 action 9:18
 active 35:16
actual 15:4; 55:9
```

```
actually 10:3; 13:4; 19:9,
 20; 20:1; 21:10; 24:18;
 27:14,24
add 25:10; 57:10
additional 2:15
address 2:5; 23:23
adequate 46:11
administrative 58:11
administrator 1:22; 5:10;
7:18; 22:7,12,16,19;
 48:14; 51:18; 52:2; 54:5;
 56:18; 57:2; 58:5,11,13,
15; 59:12
administrator's 2:13;
55:25; 56:12
admire 39:14
admit 29:15
admittedly 29:22
adopt 52:9
aesthetics 25:23
affects 42:6
affidavit 5:21; 8:7;
11:17,19; 14:14,20; 17:13
affirmative 18:23
afternoon 2:7; 25:5; 40:7;
43:22; 46:4; 47:4
agent 23:2
ago 29:17,21; 37:2
agree 48:2; 57:5
agreement 11:23
agrees 37:18
ah 54:12
ahead 55:14
alarm 3:23
Alex 43:23
allow 46:20; 53:3,19
allowance 14:6
allowed 35:24,25; 39:4;
53:14,20
almost 24:20; 26:8; 32:19
already 10:12; 24:14;
33:14; 51:16; 56:4; 57:8
although 6:12; 29:22; 38:5
among 44:16
amp 16:8
amps 16:22,23; 17:5
ancillary 33:9; 35:20
Andrews 5:14,18,21,25;
 6:3,4,6,24; 8:7; 12:8,13,
 19; 14:14,20; 18:12,18;
 23:12,14; 30:19; 40:9
Andrews' 11:19; 17:12;
 40:15
Ann 25:4,6
another 12:9; 25:15; 28:1.
 4; 30:5; 37:4; 44:16;
 57:6
answer 7:23; 14:12; 15:24;
 17:18,20; 18:22; 22:16
anybody 3:10; 32:9
apartment 35:6,8; 39:9,21
apartments 4:19; 39:9;
 41:9
apologize 50:18
apparently 14:2
appeal 2:12; 6:9,15; 28:3;
 29:1,14; 36:13; 49:14;
50:20; 52:6; 58:11,12 appeals 1:5; 24:11; 55:15
Appellant 53:12,15,17;
 57:8
applicable 55:16
Applicant 8:25; 48:19;
 49:8,13,15,23,24; 50:6
 18; 51:8,19; 54:16; 55:3,
 9,13,19; 56:12; 57:7
application 4:9,13; 21:4;
22:6; 55:11,12
```

applied 15:12,14,22; 16:4 apply 16:2; 27:2; 51:7; 54:13; 55:7 appreciate 36:1 appreciation 33:25; 35:21 appropriate 46:16,19; 49:3,17 approve 37:21 approved 15:23; 16:3 April 18:12; 26:22; 27:9; 48:15 Architectural 29:3 area 4:4,8,21,24; 5:2,18; 18:14 areas 12:10; 28:11; 31:2 aren't 29:25 argument 38:22; 41:6; 46:14; 48:25; 51:18,20 Arkansas 28:10 around 3:13; 17:14; 21:11; 30:24; 32:5; 36:4; 44:16; 55:2; 58:5 arrangement 54:25 arrangements 30:1 ascertain 42:11 asks 6:16 assert 5:1 assess 40:14 assume 12:23; 18:20 assumption 9:17 assure 29:19 atrocious 31:11 attempt 57:7 attempting 34:3 audible 23:16; 45:25; 58:23 audience 26:14; 32:17; 39:11 August 12:1; 14:20; 17:13; 47:1,20; 52:19; 57:13,16 automatic 47:8 automatically 38:24; 39:6 available 11:18; 51:3,8; 52:19; 58:16 Avenue 4:18 aware 4:23; 9:18 awful 8:5 Aye 59:2,4,6,8,10 В

back 2:10; 6:6; 8:8; 9:2, 8,21; 10:19; 17:12,16; 18:6; 26:19; 34:24; 35:5, 8; 41:14; 45:1 background 26:15 bad 55:5 balance 25:12,20,24 Ballard 4:17 barbecues 44:18 BARSHIS 42:15 base 16:8 based 6:14; 7:16; 9:17; 12:2; 22:15; 46:21; 49:8; 54:19 basement 39:12 basically 40:3 basis 11:22; 34:7 bathrooms 16:20 be... 23:3 bear 54:16 bears 53:15 beautifully 29:6 became 11:2 become 40:12; 43:14; 50:24 becomes 9:13; 10:9,16 bed 58:6 began 2:2

behind 4:8; 8:8 believe 5:9; 6:13; 11:14; 15:3; 21:16; 27:13; 33:2; 37:6,8; 43:6,15; 48:10; 49:25; 50:18; 52:8 best 36:8; 45:15,20; 54:14; 60:11 better 29:16; 39:15; 44:7 between 6:3; 8:12; 21:15; 26:17; 48:23 beyond 2:15 bias 25:8 bike 3:22 Bill 26:11,12; 36:16; 39:24 bit 8:20; 21:5; 26:15; 47:18; 50:7 blood 13:19 BOARD 1:4,17.5; 4:23; 6:16; 7:17; 8:1,3; 17:11; 26:5,14; 27:6; 28:3,21; 29:1,4,5; 33:20; 34:3; 35:24; 46:3,5,16; 48:8; 49:8,13,19,21; 54:9,16; 55:11,15; 56:23 boarders 3:2,5; 4:7; 5:13, 18,20; 6:1,18; 7:3; 10:23; 12:14; 18:16; 21:23; 23:1 boarding 13:7,10,21 bodies 43:16 body 54:9; 55:17 both 3:11; 34:18; 48:17 bought 29:7; 41:14 box 35:7 boxed 38:13 boy 28:10 break 14:6; 17:24,25 breaks 47:14 Brenda 1:25; 60:8,17 Brendel 25:4,5,6 bring 50:3 bringing 12:22; 47:11 broader 13:4 broadly 13:3 building 5:12; 14:5,10; 15:12,22; 16:3,5,6,18,24; 18:3; 20:14; 21:3,6,10, 13,14,15,16; 22:3,5; 24:10; 32:16; 39:21; 41:24; 50:21; 56:22 buildings 19:13,16; 20:2, 5,11; 21:22; 42:19 built 42:22 burden 8:25; 9:8; 48:17, 19; 53:15; 54:16; 55:19; 56:11 burglar 3:23 Burns 25:6 business 33:10; 34:4 С call 23:20; 58:24 called 27:15 calls 3:21 came 18:7; 37:13; 46:25 cannot 36:6 Caputo 1:25; 60:8,17 car 32:6; 38:13 care 29:11,25; 32:24; 33:10; 44:25; 45:3,19;

51:21 carefully 33:21 Carolyn 1:22; 22:2,22; 26:4; 27:15; 49:7; 50:11; 52:15; 58:17 Carolyn's 30:10

Carr 1:18; 9:3; 14:18,19; 15:5,8; 19:2; 47:2,3; 52:12; 55:22,23; 59:5,6 cars 45:5,6,13; 49:12; 50:25 case 23:3; 26:16,24; 31:4; 33:19; 40:17; 42:11; 55:18; 57:23; 58:1 cast 30:15 catch 45:13 catch-up 8:20 caught 34:17; 36:24 CCR 1:25; 60:8,17 certain 3:18 certainly 34:8; 37:14,21; 40:13; 42:10,17; 44:6,12; 49:24; 51:7 certified 27:12 certify 60:8 Chair 2:7; 33:14 Chairman 1:17.5 chance 37:25 Chandler 2:14,18; 4:7,15, 19,23; 5:2; 14:22; 16:18, 20,21,22; 17:5,6,8; 24:10; 25:21; 30:9; 33:19; 34:12,14,15,19; 35:13; 36:22,25; 37:10, 15; 38:6; 39:15; 40:2; 41:1,24; 42:7; 44:2; 45:2 change 5:7; 23:14; 43:1,8, 16; 53:10; 55:16,17; 56:24 changed 6:3; 7:13; 8:17; 9:6,25; 10:8,11,15; 11:3; 13:3; 23:11; 31:7,22; 39:2; 43:25 changes 7:4; 12:17; 43:1 Channing 37:3 check 27:17; 58:6 choose 49:16 Chris 49:8 Christina 1:21 circuits 16:22; 17:6 circumstances 48:3 citizens 6:8 city 2:8,19; 3:21; 7:1; 9:17; 22:17; 24:2,7,12, 24,25; 26:18,25; 27:3,4, 14,21,25; 29:4,7,8,12; 31:13; 32:23; 33:4,10; 34:25; 35:25; 38:20; 39:17; 44:1,25; 45:18,19; 52:25; 53:3; 55:12,18; 56:24; 57:23,24; 60:6 city's 53:9,14,20 claimed 57:15 cleaned 37:16; 39:21 cleans, 39:18 clear 33:5; 35:7; 43:6 clearly 4:4,21; 7:8; 43:6 close 46:1; 51:10,11 code 21:13; 57:24; 58:3 cogent 51:18,19 college 25:9,10; 36:10,15, 19; 42:20,23; 45:12; 55:4 Colony 44:17 come 27:20; 29:7,10; 33:17,18; 43:15; 44:8; 45:2,9,19; 46:24; 52:13; 58:3 comes 39:17; 56:16 coming 3:21 commend 37:11 commended 4:3; 35:21 commented 33:2 comments 4:1; 38:21; 39:22 commission 43:1; 60:25

community 25:11; 31:12; 44:19,21; 49:10; 50:20; 56:21 company 6:4; 14:24 compare 3:14; 48:4 comparison 19:10 compensation 23:1; 33:7 completely 19:24 compliance 12:16 complied 10:3 complimenting 40:1 comply 54:22 comprehensive 29:3 comprise 42:20 concern 47:21; 56:20 concerning 48:15 concerns 3:18; 56:3 conclusion 11:21; 48:16; 54:6 condition 14:2,5; 30:22; 49:17 conditions 6:18; 50:25 condo 39:20 confess 40:6 confidence 34:6 confident 16:11 confirmation 21:2 conforming 10:10; 19:8; 32:13; 38:25; 43:8 confused 21:5; 40:6; 46:7; 50:8 connection 17:13 consecutive 2:22; 6:21; 7:6,22; 9:1; 10:9 consensus 49:7,10; 50:4, 21; 56:21 consider 31:18; 33:22; 43:24 consideration 36:5; 57:8, 18 considered 58:8 constitutes 31:25 constructed 49:1 construction 21:21 contain 33:25 contemplated 19:20 contentions 40:15 contingent 29:4 continue 9:14; 10:18; 29:24; 34:21 continued 3:17; 6:20; 7:5, 15,20; 11:22; 18:12; 33:16,22; 34:2 continuously 40:12; 41:25 contribution 4:3 controlled 14:23,24; 18:19 controls 21:25 convince 47:25 cooling 16:9 copies 16:17; 53:11; 56:6, correct 8:9; 12:17; 13:1; 20:4; 50:6; 52:23 correctly 12:25 corridor 25:16 corroboration 40:15 couldn't 3:20; 10:11; 21:10 council 26:17; 35:25; 55:13,18; 56:24 count 32:18; 41:6 country 28:10 County 34:25 couple 4:16; 6:3; 8:2; 35:16; 38:21 courier 27:22 course 3:10; 26:9; 27:25; | distinct 50:10

COMMONWEALTH 60:5

28:2; 40:25; 58:8 Court/Pollard 4:8,23 creating 30:15 criteria 54:8,18 critical 42:5 current 5:7; 6:12,14; 7:21; 19:6; 54:22; 56:8

damaged 16:19 Darr 42:15 date 47:10; 57:25 dates 15:13; 16:23; 56:5 Dave 35:9,10 David 1:19; 5:14; 6:23; 23:11,14 day 4:24; 29:18; 32:4; 34:21; 60:12 days 46:10 deal 25:10; 36:20 debatable 6:13 decades 43:4 decide 29:5; 34:6; 43:5 decided 49:9,13 decision 2:13; 7:17; 22:12,23; 24:8; 46:16; 48:1; 49:2,8; 50:2,11; 51:20; 52:2; 55:25; 56:13; 58:12; 59:12 decisions 18:17 Dee 1:21.5 deed 15:4 defer 46:16; 57:6 deference 58:15 deferral 51:15 deferred 51:16 defined 3:4; 5:16; 7:1; 11:1; 13:16,21 defining 31:6 definition 10:4; 13:22; 19:12; 21:12; 24:17; 32:6 definitively 48:7.21 delay 28:1,5; 51:11 delicate 49:6 deliver 27:22 Dell 26:11,12; 30:4; 33:23; 36:17 demonstrates 6:23 deny 29:1,13; 30:2 depend 12:18; 36:7 deserve 36:5 designation 5:7 designed 25:25; 33:9 desperate 36:10 destroyed 17:15 deteriorate 29:10,25 determination 50:14 determine 6:16,19; 48:14 Dick 35:19 difference 19:12,14; 21:15 differences 35:13,14 different 16:5; 17:2,15; 21:4; 32:7; 40:10; 41:14 difficult 58:2 dig 48:4 dinosaurs 24:3 direct 29:12 direction 50:4; 56:25 directly 34:13 discussed 28:7 discussion 3:16; 41:21; 48:11; 51:24; 54:1,3; 58:22 disputes 34:18 dissimilar 38:8 distance 36:11

distinctions 41:8 distinguished 13:6 district 4:13; 53:21 divided 22:8,14 documentary 17:23; 46:9 dog 47:11 doing 26:4; 58:6 domain 36:14 done 3:14; 19:10; 25:22; 37:12; 38:1; 56:25; 57:9 door 38:7 dormitories 30:12 down 32:3; 56:16 downtown 36:11 drain 35:7 drive 32:3,5; 38:4; 42:16 due 46:13; 58:14 during 12:11; 57:15 dwelling 2:16,25; 3:4; 5:11,16; 7:1,11; 9:5,6; 10:22,25; 12:9,10; 14:16; 19:4; 22:10,11,20; 31:10; 41:11,12; 53:2,4,6,7,9, 11,14,21; 54:7; 55:11 dwellings 24:10; 25:19; 53:22

E e-mail 3:19 each 6:2,6; 12:4,5; 16:7; 41:10 earlier 6:13; 41:23; 54:15 early 34:24; 46:23 easiest 28:20 eat 44:15 economic 49:21 effect 33:2 efforts 30:10; 37:20 either 12:13; 14:23; 24:16; 47:7 elect 31:14 elected 33:3,6; 54:10 electoral 33:8 electrical 16:7,20,25 Elizabeth 1:18.5 emotional 56:16 encourage 57:1 end 11:21 enforce 58:3 enforced 57:24 enforcing 57:25 enhance 33:11 enjoy 38:11 enjoys 53:18 enter 11:22 entire 12:12; 27:5 entirely 4:25 entities 6:24; 18:19 entrances 7:8 envision 26:9 era 32:3 err 50:11; 56:18 erred 48:14; 54:6 error 58:13,14 especially 42:18; 51:19 essentially 49:20,22 establish 23:10,12; 50:22; 53:12,15; 54:21 established 2:18; 5:5; 6:17,25; 7:2; 10:12; 18:18; 19:1 establishes 17:24 establishing 23:4 estimation 36:21 estoppel 57:22 even 21:3; 27:18; 29:11 everybody 32:19; 34:20;

36:24; 42:1,7 everyone 44:6 everything 44:15,25 evidence 33:21; 43:7; 46:9; 53:5,18; 54:19,20; 57:1; 14,18 exactly 16:10; 37:7 example 40:9; 50:24 except 32:19 excerpt 4:9 exciting 3:8 executed 56:5 exist 28:13; 30:16 existed 28:14 existing 13:23 exists 33:21 expecting 29:8 experience 36:23; 42:10 experienced 3:8 expertise 26:6; 58:10,15, 16 expiration 47:10 expires 60:25 express 32:22 expressed 55:24 expressing 34:6 extensions 47:8 extent 3:13 externally 3:12 extremely 57:5

facade 24:9 faced 54:23 fact 9:24; 19:25; 21:3,7; 25:14; 26:2; 27:24; 28:22; 30:16; 31:23; 32:4,5; 35:23; 40:11; 41:11; 42:2; 48:1; 50:23; 57:10,24 facts 54:14 factually 23:10 faculty 4:18,22; 5:1 fail 53:12 failed 53:17 fairly 8:6; 38:2 families 18:4 family 7:1; 11:1; 12:13 16,20,21,23; 13:3,12,15, 19; 14:24; 23:2,3,10,14; 26:1; 28:9; 31:17,18,20, 23,25; 36:17; 41:5; 44:11,12 fantastic 44:9 far 38:1; 57:18 fashion 20:20 fathers 31:14 February 15:7; 18:11 federal 28:16,19; 33:23 feel 24:24; 36:16; 49:17; 54:25; 55:24 few 34:14; 35:4; 44:24 fewer 24:4 fiddle 33:12 file 49:9,10,15,24 finally 28:3; 58:9 find 7:18; 27:20; 49:7; 55:19; 58:6,13 findings 52:21 fine 23:21; 36:22 fire 17:14,17 first | 4:21; 18:23; 23:5, 20,24,25; 27:24; 29:15; 34:22; 38:6; 43:12,13,24; 44:5,17; 46:8; 49:6;

52:13

fit 45:7

five 37:2; 46:3; 57:13 fixtures 17:7 flat 41:24,25; 42:12 floor 1:9.5; 4:15; 46:6 follow 47:13 followed 46:14 follows 2:3 foot 35:11 foregoing 60:9 Forest 42:16 forgive 8:19 form 13:11; 52:8,10 forms 40:10 forth 2:13,19,24; 4:12; 5:6,11,22,24; 6:18; 7:14, 19; 10:23,24; 11:17,19; 41:15; 54:18 fortunate 36:16 forward 10:17; 30:5; 46:15; 55:14 found 54:20 four 16:8; 17:8; 37:2; 39:2; 40:21; 44:24; 45:6, 8; 49:12; 50:25 four-unit 39:9 fraternity 42:9 friendly 35:10,12 friends 34:18,20; 38:8 friendship 38:11 front 22:19; 37:13; 54:3 full 29:22; 39:12 fully 29:8; 56:4 functions 33:9; 35:20 further 9:7; 34:16; 46:20; 58:22 Furthermore 3:16; 11:20 fuse 35:6

G

garage 19:18; 20:6 Gary 16:19; 34:10,11 gay 31:22 Gazette 37:13,14 GEARY 39:24; 42:13 generally 48:11 generated 27:7 generic 15:21 gentleman 44:4 getting 21:4; 58:21 give 24:13; 36:4; 57:7; 58:14 given 37:8,24; 46:8,21; 47:4 GODDIN 38:19,20; 39:13 Goodwin 38:20 got 16:20,22; 20:22; 47:16; 48:2,10; 56:3 government 43:16 grandfathered 22:21; 41:10 Granger 2:10; 15:1,2,5,13, 18,19; 16:1,2,4,16; 17:16; 18:8,13; 21:9; 37:12,20,25; 40:1; 45:6 Granger's 3:6,25 grant 49:20 great 25:10 greater 56:20 Greg 2:10; 17:16; 25:22 Griffin 4:18 ground 50:21 group 13:6 guess 11:10; 14:9 guests 23:1

half 29:21 Hall 37:3 handled 37:21 hands 6:3; 18:11 happen 36:20; 37:25 happened 8:12; 9:19; 48:23 happens 32:10; 37:6; 44:2 happy 15:20; 25:20; 45:2 head 41:6 health 25:11 hear 40:21 heard 27:6; 41:3,4,6,21,23 hearing 3:17; 8:20,22,24; 11:8,10; 17:14; 30:5; 46:2; 47:1,20; 48:13; 50:9 hearings 24:6; 32:21; 52:19 heat 17:8 heaters 17:7 heating 16:8 help 9:23; 31:15; 43:14; 52:15 helpful 56:10 Hi 38:19 high 49:23; 55:25; 56:1,11 Hill 42:16 himself 35:11 hire 26:3 historic 4:11 historically 54:17 history 4:5; 5:2; 41:10; 50:23 home 3:14; 24:3,12; 30:19, 20; 34:14; 39:8,19; 43:24; 44:21 homeowner 24:3; 25:1 homeowners 4:14; 25:16 honest 46:22 honor 24:18 honored 23:25 hope 25:6; 26:2; 31:4,15; 33:20,22; 37:22 hopefully 32:23 house 3:9,11; 4:1; 5:19; 13:7,10,12,21; 22:13; 24:20; 25:25; 31:5,16; 32:1; 34:12,19,23,24; 35:2,7; 36:12; 37:14,16, 18,21; 38:4,7,8; 39:15; 40:1,19; 41:4,13,15,16, 17; 42:1,8; 44:3,8 housed 19:18; 20:7 housekeeping 13:6,17; 18:6,15 houses 13:12 housing 55:4 however 4:25; 27:2; 34:22; 48:6; 55:7; 56:24

i.e 51:1 i.e. 28:12 immune 4:22 impacted 34:15; 37:19 important 26:13; 35:18; 36:1; 40:5,6; 41:8; 42:9 importantly 29:12 impression 13:10 improper 10:11,16; 20:23 inadvertently 31:8 inaudible 35:6,22; 37:12 incapable 14:4 include 52:7; 53:21

I

included 4:14,19 income 28:16,18,19,21; 33:24 inconsistent 6:11 incontrovertible 27:1 incorporated 2:9; 28:1 increase 16:21,23; 17:5 incredibly 49:22 incurred 28:4 indeed 35:11 index 34:2 Indian 26:13; 34:12 indicate 8:24; 53:10 indicated 2:14; 6:13; 14:10; 32:17,24 individual 27:11,15 individually 12:4; 16:15, individuals 6:4; 13:8; 32:15 information 6:22; 8:5,11; 22:15; 47:4 inhabiting 18:3 injustice 29:11 inner 29:8 inquiring 15:3 inside 35:11; 44:8; 46:4 insofar 50:13 install 16:22; 17:8 installed 16:6 instances 55:4 instead 41:13 insufficient 54:21 intended 51:13 intentions 30:14 interest 36:8 interested 31:19 internal 36:25 internally 3:11 interpreted 13:4 interpreting 56:18 interruption 2:21; 6:20; 7:6,16; 10:19; 11:4 invaded 29:9 investors 42:25 invite 32:9; 44:2,7 involved 35:17 irrelevant 9:20; 48:25; 49:1 isn't 4:21 issue 4:4,25; 5:4; 18:19; 22:9; 24:6; 28:4; 32:4, 13; 33:16; 34:2; 37:15, 24; 39:16; 40:4; 41:9,22; 44:10,22; 49:6; 50:15; 56:16 issued 16:19; 17:9 issues 30:15,22,25; 31:22; 40:8,14; 42:5; 45:1; 50:10; 54:24 issuing 48:14

Jack 25:6,14

James 34:25

Jamestown 42:18

Jennifer 57:12

jeopardized 25:17

job 26:4,17; 37:12; 43:18;

54:13

jog 3:9

John 2:8; 33:13

join 39:25

Judy 1:17.5

jump 39:8

June 16:24,25; 17:9; 47:10

jurisdiction 56:21

justify 55:20

K

Kafes 1:19.5; 14:1,9; 18:2; 33:1,5; 46:5,7; 47:3; 48:1; 51:2; 52:5; 53:25; 57:3,4; 59:1,2 Kaiser 23:24,25; 24:1; 25:3 keen 40:2 keep 25:2; 30:10; 37:1; 45:7 kept 35:10 kind 44:5; 49:7; 57:14 kinds 30:24 knowledge 55:12 known 14:21 knows 40:20 Knudson 1:17.5; 2:5; 7:25; 13:25; 14:18; 15:9; 17:2, 10; 18:1; 23:15,17,19; 25:3; 26:11; 30:3,7; 33:13; 34:10; 38:17; 39:23; 42:13; 43:20; 45:23; 46:1; 47:2,23; 49:4; 51:14,25; 52:3,15; 53:23; 54:1; 55:22; 56:14; 57:3; 58:19,24; 59:7,8,11

Lafayette 1:10 laid 43:6 Lamson 1:19; 15:11,16,21; 16:2,13; 49:4,5,25; 50:17; 56:14,15; 59:3,4 landlords 29:10 landscaping 29:21 Lane 4:17; 25:6; 39:25 language 31:7; 33:12 large 36:10; 42:19 largely 14:4 last 3:17; 8:19,22,24; 11:8,10; 16:13; 27:7; 28:2; 33:15; 45:10; 57:13 Lastly 43:10 late 58:21 later 47:19; 57:25 law 25:14,15; 31:1; 34:7, 8,9; 39:2; 54:13; 55:2,7; 57:22 lawful 2:18,20; 3:4; 6:16, 25; 7:2,15,18,20; 9:9,13, 16,20; 10:1,2,16; 18:10, 18,21,25; 20:24 lawfully 7:14 lawn 29:21 laws 31:1,3; 52:25; 53:3 lawyer 38:21,22; 40:14; 48:4 learn 33:19 learned 34:22; 35:2 lease 11:21,23; 12:9; 18:13; 28:12; 43:24; 47:10 leased 12:10; 47:14; 56:9 leases 5:25; 10:21,24; 11:7,9,12,15,16,18,25; 13:7; 17:21; 47:6,7,15, 22; 53:12; 56:3,7,10 leasing 21:7 least 3:2; 5:14; 11:6; 32:11; 46:10; 49:2 leave 30:5; 45:15 left 31:8

legal 5:4; 7:4; 22:14,16;

38:23; 39:5; 40:13,14; 42:5; 43:25; 50:1,12,19; 53:10,18; 54:18; 57:21 legalism 30:25 legally 39:1,3,4; 43:7,9; 53:13; 54:7 legitimacy 29:2 letter 2:13; 5:6; 11:11, 14; 15:3; 26:20; 27:11, 16,19,22,25; 34:8; 47:20; 48:15,17 levels 46:8 Lewis 1:25; 60:8,17 liaison 26:17 life 25:22 light 57:1 likes 34:17; 36:24 liking 40:24 limit 39:13; 53:7 limited 53:1; 54:5 limiting 50:25 linking 50:9 list 36:3 listen 47:5 listened 32:23 lists 12:2 literal 56:17 little 8:20; 21:5; 26:15; 47:18; 50:7 live 22:10; 24:2,3,15; 25:16; 26:12; 30:9; 34:11; 35:1; 36:12,14; 42:16; 44:15,24; 55:3 lived 5:23; 33:18; 34:19; 37:15 lively 25:11 lives 36:14 living 4:13; 12:13; 13:5, 16; 18:15; 19:19; 20:12; 25:25; 30:11,20; 31:20, 22; 35:5; 36:16,22; 38:6, 12; 44:9; 54:24 located 2:18; 19:17; 20:5 lodging 22:25 Lone-G 2:9,11; 18:8; 26:22; 27:22 Lone-G's 27:23; 38:22 long 6:14; 9:8; 10:16; 14:4; 17:17; 57:20 longer 13:13 look 12:3; 15:20; 21:18; 24:9; 29:19; 30:5; 36:7; 42:1; 55:3 looked 11:25; 12:8 looking 14:3; 22:24; 23:7; 36:11; 41:23 looks 16:25; 24:12; 29:16, 19; 38:4; 39:15; 44:7; 47:12 loosen 24:17 lost 25:24; 46:22; 49:20 lot 8:5; 19:17; 20:6; 21:14; 29:20; 37:16; 39:21; 45:6,11,14; 54:3 lots 12:3; 39:18 love 36:12; 44:9 lovely 24:10 loyal 24:24 lumping 12:6,7

М

Madam 2:7; 33:14 made 4:2; 7:4,14; 20:23; 22:7,12,22; 26:24; 28:3; 30:1,25; 33:23; 38:15,22; 42:12; 43:8; 45:6; 51:18,

Madison 34:24 mail 27:12 main 13:12; 21:10,14; 37:15; 45:17 mainly 40:18 maintain 4:24; 10:16; 29:8,24 maintained 2:20; 7:8; 41:25 maintaining 10:1 major 37:24 majority 16:14 makeover 3:11 manifest 58:13,14 many 3:25; 6:8; 9:11; 16:11; 22:10; 36:9; 38:15; 42:21; 56:5; 58:4, marvelous 40:1 Mary 4:20,22; 25:4,5; 42:20; 44:14,20; 55:1,2 mass 2:10 material 46:17 materials 46:25; 48:2,5 matter 2:6; 20:17,19; 34:6; 35:23; 42:5; 48:12; 51:16 matters 31:1 maturity 56:5 meals 22:25 mean 9:11,22; 10:5; 39:4, 16; 40:10; 41:4 means 8:14; 31:5; 38:24; 54:10 mechanical 17:8 meet 49:9,19,23; 50:21; 54:7,18 meeting 12:1; 14:20; 27:7; 30:5; 46:9,10 member 6:24; 14:24,25; 23:2; 39:11 members 1:17.5; 8:3; 26:5; 29:5; 32:17; 35:25; 43:23; 44:13; 45:17; 46:3 memorandum 46:20 mention 28:6; 46:2 mentioned 56:4; 60:10 messed 31:9 met 48:19; 50:1; 55:19 meter 16:8 meters 7:9; 16:6 middle 34:17,20; 36:24; 50:21: 58:5 might 31:19; 46:15; 52:20 mind 29:1; 48:24; 58:16 minor 35:6 minutes 8:23,24; 9:3 misrepresented 30:13 missed 24:6 modified 13:18 modifying 49:18 moisture 16:19 money 39:18,22 month 3:10; 6:21; 7:22; 28:2; 29:21; 57:6 month's 28:1 month-to-month 11:22 months 2:22; 3:23; 7:6; 10:6; 29:17 morning 25:21 most 8:5; 26:16; 30:16,17, 18; 34:8,15; 37:18 mostly 35:8 mothers 31:14 motion 51:22,24; 52:4; 53:24; 56:13; 58:18,20; 59:11

motivated 3:9

move 24:20; 52:1,9 moved 5:15; 12:9; 25:9; 35:1; 38:6; 42:17; 45:9 moves 43:12 MS. 2:5; 5:5; 7:14,25; 8:1,2,10,18,23; 9:15,23; 11:5,11,24; 12:15,22; 13:9,24,25; 14:18; 15:3, 9; 16:17; 17:2,4,10,12; 18:1; 19:9; 20:4,10; 21:1,17,24; 22:2,4,6,24; 23:7,15,17,19,25; 25:3,5; 26:11,19; 30:3,7; 33:13; 34:10; 38:17; 39:23; 42:13; 43:20; 45:23; 46:1,5,6,25; 47:1,19,23, 24; 49:4,15; 50:7; 51:5, 6,9,14,23,25; 52:1,3,8, 15,17,18; 53:23; 54:1,2; 55:22,24; 56:14; 57:3,4; 58:9,19,24; 59:1,3,5,7,8, 9,10,11 much 5:2; 25:17; 32:25; 34:16; 37:1; 38:11,16; 45:23; 47:21 multifamily 53:22 multiple 22:21 Murphy 1:22; 5:5; 7:14; 15:3; 16:17; 17:4; 22:4; 26:4,19; 47:1,19; 51:9; 52:17; 58:17 Murphy's 11:11 must 9:16; 52:13 myself 14:23,24; 33:16,25

name 23:22; 24:1; 26:12; 38:19; 39:24; 42:15; 43:22 name's 2:8 names 23:20 national 4:10 necessary 16:9,11 need 10:19; 21:2; 25:7,12; 52:7; 58:14,21 needed 13:13 needs 24:7 negative 18:24 neighbor 31:15; 32:10; 35:10 neighborhood 4:6,12; 6:11, 12; 25:2,18; 26:17; 31:5; 32:15; 38:4; 43:13,14,17; 45:21; 50:4 neighborhoods 24:9; 29:9; 30:10,11,18; 31:11 neighbors 32:22; 34:5; 37:5,6; 40:22; 43:3,14, 15; 45:22 neighbors' 30:14 never 28:14; 35:11 new 4:8; 11:7; 26:25; 27:7; 32:6; 36:17 next 25:4; 38:7,13 night 58:5 nine 25:24; 31:10; 32:12, 15; 36:9; 42:2,8; 50:22 No. 4:8; 8:8 noble 55:5 nobody 34:17 noise 38:14 noncommercial 19:19; 20:7 nonconformance 7:21; 27:1; 28:9 nonconforming 2:15,19,21; 5:5; 6:17,20; 7:4,5,15, 19,20; 8:17; 9:14,25;

10:4,9,10,17,18; 11:2; 14:7; 18:7,10,18,21,25; 19:8; 20:25; 22:14,17; 23:5;11,13; 27:10; 32:13; 38:23; 39:1,4,6; 42:22, 24; 43:9; 48:11,16; 50:1, 13, 19; 53:16, 18; 54:8, 17, 21; 55:21 none 46:11 nonetheless 35:12; 36:14 nonrelated 32:15 nonresidential 19:20 nor 43:11 normal 48:3 note |11:11 notes 45:15 nothing 4:8; 41:22; 48:20; 58:7 noticed 37:11; 42:19 notified 26:23 nuclear 13:15 number 16:4; 18:17; 20:13, 15; 41:20; 45:4; 46:8; 51:8 numbers 36:10

0

object 30:17 objected 30:21 objections 30:15 observation 47:7,17 obviously 42:6; 48:3,17; 54:23 occasions 35:4 occupancy 12:2; 33:17,22; 34:2; 53:1,19 occupants 43:4; 49:11; 50:25 occupied 12:12,15; 19:5; 35:8; 38:7; 44:13; 53:8, 13 occupying 12:23; 13:5,7, 12; 58:4 occurrence 36:19 October 15:1,4; 26:19; 60:12 office 27:17 officials 33:3,6 often 43:15 oftentimes 43:11; 45:13 okay 19:10; 21:24; 32:19; 42:8; 47:17 once 9:12; 10:9; 35:11; 37:1; 51:16 one 4:17; 5:18; 12:4,9,10; 13:5,16; 18:14,17,23; 20:4,13; 21:3,6,9,15; 22:2,4,11; 24:2; 25:14; 27:9; 28:20; 29:5,17; 31:2; 32:4,16,21; 34:15, 25; 35:7; 36:24; 37:19; 39:4; 41:4,5,11; 43:23; 44:16; 46:12; 47:9,17; 50:14 one- 9:5 one-family 3:3; 5:11,16; 9:6 only 2:5; 3:21; 10:8,19; 13:16; 19:4; 21:15; 39:22; 44:24; 45:8; 55:10,17; 58:12 onus 27:21 opinion 26:4 opinions 32:23 opportunity 30:8; 46:11,17 opposed 51:15 opposition 32:11

option 51:6 options 51:8 order 4:5; 10:1; 31:3; 46:14: 49:19 ordinance 2:20,24; 3:4; 5:16,20; 6:19; 7:2,13,19, 21; 8:15,17; 9:4,10,25; 10:4,8,11,13,15,24; 11:1, 3; 12:17,20; 13:2,3,4,15, 18,20,21; 19:2,6,7,11,14, 21,24; 20:3,11,16,17,19, 23,24; 21:18,20; 22:22; 23:11; 48:18; 49:18; 53:14; 54:8,18,22; 55:16, ordinances 24:18,19; 29:13; 43:2; 46:23 organizations 41:14 other 4:16; 5:3; 6:4,24; 8:3; 11:16; 12:10,11; 13:25; 15:9; 17:11,20; 18:1,16; 23:15; 26:21; 28:8,15; 30:1,21,22,24; 39:14; 41:20; 44:16; 47:18; 48:12; 50:14; 51:6; 53:5,20; 55:4; 57:23 others 35:3 otherwise 28:12; 47:25 ought 51:17 ourselves 37:1 out 11:6; 14:2; 17:18; 18:16; 19:22,25; 20:10; 21:7; 27:17,20; 29:18; 31:8; 35:1; 36:7; 37:9, 23; 40:20; 43:6,17; 44:6, 17,21; 46:20,25; 54:12; 58:6 outset 25:13 outside 21:11; 24:11; 46:4 over 3:18; 28:23; 35:14; 36:10; 38:3; 43:4; 44:18; 56:21 overpopulation 25:17 overturn 58:12 overturning 55:25 overwhelmed 36:18 owe 24:22,23 Owens 33:13,14 owes 24:12 own 16:8; 34:12,24; 42:23 owned 6:5; 14:23; 40:11,19 owner 6:10,23; 19:5; 26:25; 27:9; 33:24; 37:4, 17; 41:16; 42:7 owner-occupied 19:4 ownership 40:10 owning 30:20 owns 45:12

p.m 1:8
pack 45:5
package 12:1; 14:19,25;
27:5; 47:4; 52:13,19
packages 47:1
packet 3:20; 5:10; 6:22;
11:15; 17:21; 52:9,22
packing 32:2; 42:7
page 37:13
pages 60:9
paid 15:16
parade 39:25
parameters 24:17
parents 31:19
Park 4:8,14
Park/Chandler 4:10

parking 37:24; 45:6,11,14 part 5:2; 12:9,10; 13:22; 20:14; 31:4; 32:7; 33:8; 38:15; 40:17; 44:19; 52:18; 56:18 particular 4:13; 6:7; 17:17; 23:3; 26:16,20; 27:2,18; 28:7,12,22,23; 30:2; 35:12,17; 54:24; 55:17,18; 58:7 particularly 29:20; 35:5 particulars 5:22 parties 32:20 pass 3:12 passed 14:2 past 3:9; 35:16 pay 24:13; 38:15 people 2:10; 4:13; 13:8; 18:3; 22:10,21; 23:20; 24:14; 26:14; 30:11,21 31:2,10,14,22; 32:12,20; 36:7,18; 37:22; 39:25; 40:4; 41:18,20; 42:2; 43:15; 45:4,11; 57:11; 58:4,6 percent 29:16 perhaps 31:7,18; 36:18; 49:9,10; 50:3; 56:10; 57:7 period 6:7,21; 7:22; 10:5, 9; 12:12; 14:6,11; 17:22; 48:9; 57:15 periods 28:24; 48:21 permanent 44:23 permit 16:18,21,24,25; 17:6,8; 53:9 permits 5:12; 15:12,22,23; 16:3,5,7,9,12,14,17; 19:3; 21:21,22 permitted 5:20; 10:13; 21:3 permitting 24:9 person 11:20; 40:11; 41:15 personal 38:10 personally 25:8; 38:12 persons 13:5,16 photographs 14:1,3,11,15 photos 3:12 picture 26:7 piece 28:8,17; 51:11 pieces 28:22 place 5:16; 23:13; 35:1, 20; 39:18; 56:22,23; 60:10 places 4:11; 36:11; 55:3 plan 29:2,3 planning 42:16; 43:1 play 54:11; 55:8 playing 8:20; 40:3,4,18 please 2:5; 23:22; 29:13; 30:2; 45:2,8; 58:25 pleased 38:3 plumbing 17:6 podium 23:22 point 10:2,17; 11:5; 27:3; 45:17; 47:11; 49:16; 51:15 police 3:22; 45:15 political 54:13 politics 54:11 Pollard 4:10,14 population 24:23,24 position 8:10,18; 9:15; 11:6; 12:24; 21:5,6,24; 46:20; 55:5,6 positive 3:25; 15:20 possible 28:13

postal 7:9

postponed 27:8 Power 7:9 practice 11:20; 44:14 precedent 24:8,16; 40:6; 50:2 preclude 57:25 premises 13:5; 19:19; 20:7,15 preparation 11:8 prepared 36:20; 40:14; 47:25 preponderance 53:17 present 1:21; 6:9; 7:5; 52:20: 53:10 presentation 6:23; 10:21; 40:7; 41:3; 48:20; 54:20 presented 8:4; 27:6; 46:18 presumption 6:13 pretty 36:25; 47:21 previous 29:6: 44:4 previously 48:5 price 38:15 primarily 44:13 principal 2:11,24; 5:11; 6:5,25; 18:9,14; 20:21,22 principally 3:3; 5:15; 6:10; 7:11; 10:25 principals 37:7 prior 3:17; 5:7; 6:23; 8:11; 10:13; 23:13; 24:6; 28:7; 43:8; 46:10; 53:2; 55:9 private 19:18; 20:6; 45:14 privy 27:5; 52:20 probably 13:2 problem 32:8,15; 37:4,8; 38:12; 45:10; 46:12 problems 30:16,23; 36:25; 37:5,23; 45:20 procedurally 56:25 proceedings 2:2; 60:10 process 28:1; 33:9; 35:18 professionals 26:3 program 44:18 proof 9:1; 27:1,2; 28:9, 12; 48:17; 53:15; 55:20 proper 10:15,21; 20:16,18, 19,23; 25:18 properly 47:14 properties 4:16,23; 34:1; 42:21,22,24 property 2:14,17; 3:1,3,7; 4:2,6; 5:5,6,15,25; 6:2, 5,10,17; 7:8,10,18; 9:12; 11:21; 14:2,3,21,23; 15:1,4; 18:5,8,9,11; 19:1; 22:8; 26:20,22; 27:10; 28:6,8,17,18,19, 23; 29:7,8,11,16,18,19, 24; 33:24,25; 38:23; 40:2,9,11,12,16; 42:6; 43:3,9,13; 44:7; 46:3; 47:14; 49:1,12,21; 50:1, 12,13,23; 51:1,7,12; 53:1,4,5,6,8,11,13,16,18; 54:6; 55:10,17; 56:8; 57:15; 58:4 property's 3:7 protect 25:1; 31:2,15 prove 10:2,3,8; 11:3; 54:16 proved 50:19 provide 34:1; 36:4 provided 4:9; 5:10,23; 6:22; 11:10,12,25; 12:20; 14:14; 27:3,4; 43:7; 53:12 provision 20:24

public 3:17; 24:1; 46:1 publicly 52:19 puddles 29:23 pulled 16:9,11,12,14 pumps 17:9 purchase 3:6; 15:5; 55:9, purchased 14:21; 15:1; 18:8; 26:22; 28:6; 42:25; 51:9 purpose 31:3,4; 48:13; 53:20 purposes 32:22; 51:13; 53:2,8 put 3:20; 4:9,11; 12:16; 27:21; 39:21; 44:17; 45:1; 47:1; 48:6; 51:17 puts 40:21 q

qualifying 55:20 quality 36:13 Quartes 38:8,11,14; 57:12 quarters 19:18,19; 20:6,12 quasicjudicial 54:9 question 14:8,9; 15:11,21; 16:13; 17:17; 18:22; 19:9,23; 22:7,13,18,19, 22; 34:1; 46:18; 48:1,6, 24; 50:8,10,18; 54:5; 56:6; 58:3,16 questions 7:23; 8:1,2; 13:25; 15:9; 17:11; 18:1; 23:15; 29:2; 47:16; 49:5; 51:3 quick 15:11; 38:21 quickly 8:6 quite 28:13; 34:13; 35:4, 10,15 quoted 46:22

raised 44:10,22 rather 24:8; 30:11 rationale 49:3; 54:4 reached 56:2 read 14:25; 52:10 reading 52:23 ready 49:2 real 38:21; 41:9; 54:24 really 3:9; 25:22; 30:16; 37:24; 41:6; 42:4,9; 46:11,14,22; 51:16; 54:25; 57:7,9 reason 24:11 reasonable 25:12; 30:18 reasons 11:19; 32:21; 47:20; 52:6,11; 53:22; 55:13; 58:17,20 rebutted 27:16 receipt 27:13 received 3:20,25; 27:18, 21; 37:2; 46:10 recognize 6:8 recognized 30:19 reconcile 19:25 record 23:23; 32:10,19; 46:2, 55:8; 57:18 Recording 2:2 records 17:15; 33:24; 53:9 reducing 50:23

references 3:21

refused 27:12.20

regard, 33:16,23

Regarding 37:10

reflects 55:8

register 4:10 registered 43:25; 44:1; 45:18 regret 30:4 regulations 28:17 rejuvenation 3:8; 4:2 related 13:19; 44:13 relations 36:23 relationship 35:9 relevant 4:25; 6:15; 8:12, 15 rely 19:24 relying 9:24; 21:1,19 remainder 5:19 remains 35:23 remarkable 3:10 remarkably 44:7 remember 21:8 remodeling 25:23 removed 14:17 renewals 47:16 renovations 26:23 rent 6:18; 41:18,19; 42:25 rental 17:15; 19:3; 21:15; 25:19; 32:12; 34:23; 42:23; 43:13 rentals 3:19; 4:7,24; 5:1; 6:15; 30:18 rented 4:18,19; 5:19,25; 10:23; 11:2; 12:19; 18:16; 25:14; 28:23; 30:19; 40:20 renter 33:25 renters 25:14 renting 3:1,5; 5:13,17; 7:2; 12:21; 18:9; 21:23; 22:25; 28:17; 30:20; 31:25; 32:1; 40:16 repair 14:15 repairing 16:19 repairs 35:6 repeat 33:15 replace 17:7 replaced 16:6 report 3:23; 28:18 Reported 1:24.5 Reporter 60:17.5 reporting 31:19 reports 28:22 represent 25:1 representative 5:24 representatives 27:23 representing 2:9; 37:4 request 7:17; 18:7; 27:13; 30:2; 50:9,16 requested 27:13; 28:4; 35:5 requesting 35:4; 49:11 require 19:7; 52:5 requirement 56:19 resale 51:1 resembled 13:11 reside 18:12; 24:13; 25:6 resided 5:18 residence 3:2,5; 5:6,13; 7:3; 18:9,15; 19:17; 20:6; 21:23; 23:1; 26:22; 43:7,25; 58:7 residences 17:3 resident 2:8; 23:2,3,10, 14; 35:3; 57:13,17 residential 20:12; 54:7 residents 34:25; 37:16; 44:19,23; 50:22 resolution 30:6; 52:7,9, 10,14,22

resolve 28:20

regards 29:20

respect 5:4; 19:3; 36:5; 42:10; 46:13; 50:12; 57:12; 58:1,10 respected 34:21 respectfully 7:16 response 23:16; 45:25; 58:23 restate 50:17 result 40:13 return 27:12; 38:16 returns 28:19; 40:16 reversal 51:20 reverse 7:17 review 9:7; 29:3; 33:20; 46:12 reviewing 11:13; 21:21 revolves 44:16 rezoned 53:7 rezoning 51:7; 55:13 Richmond 24:2; 42:19 rights 2:15 rigid 45:7 Road 24:2; 34:24; 42:18,19 roll 58:24 roomers 4:15; 10:23; 11:2; 12:14; 18:4,10; 19:3; 41:5 rooming 31:5 rooms 3:1,5; 5:13,17,25; 6:18; 7:3; 12:11,12; 19:3; 21:23; 22:25; 25:15; 28:23; 41:19 RS-2 53:20 rule 40:22,23; 57:22 rules 31:21; 33:11; 40:3, 4,5,19; 41:2; 42:3,9; 43:5,16,18; 46:9; 52:5; 55:8 run 30:24 running 7:10; 38:2 Ruth 23:24; 24:1 -----

sail 44:17 sailing 44:14,17 same 19:17; 20:5,15,20; 26:24; 57:17 sample 5:24 saw 3:14 saying 9:19; 10:10,20; 12:19; 13:13; 18:2; 20:16; 43:16 says 20:5,17,20; 21:13; 22:24; 27:16; 39:18 scales 34:1 schedule 45:7 school 25:14 schools 40:20 Scott 1:21.5; 59:1,3,5,7,9 scrounge 55:2 second 1:9.5; 18:19,23; 52:3,12,14; 53:23,25; 58:9,18 Secretary 1:21.5 Section 2:23; 7:1; 19:15 see 3:10,11; 7:7; 8:6; 13:11; 26:6,7; 28:21; 31:16; 37:6; 40:3; 50:3 seem 28:11,20; 45:21 seemingly 35:8 seems 24:7; 39:7; 40:16; 41:20 seen 3:7; 57:14 sees 22:17 selected 26:6 send 27:22 sense 42:4; 50:20; 56:17

sent 26:20; 27:11,12,16,25 sentiments 55:24 separate 7:8,9; 11:23; 18:14,22; 21:8; 22:8,14; 50:10 separated 6:2 separates 6:6 September 1:7.5; 60:25 servants 19:18; 20:7 serve 25:1; 31:3; 33:6 service 7:9,10; 16:7,21, 23; 17:5 serving 22:25 set 2:13,19; 4:12; 5:6,24; 6:18; 7:14,19; 10:23,24; 11:16,19; 24:17; 35:11, 19; 50:2; 54:18 sets 2:24; 5:11,22 seven 40:23; 41:20; 47:12 several 3:9,23; 6:3; 12:11; 29:17; 47:7,12; 49:5; 55:23; 56:4 shadows 30:15 shape 13:11 share 3:19; 55:23 shared 47:19 Shelly 34:10,11 ship 38:2,3 show 2:17,23; 3:2; 9:8; 28:22; 32:11,19; 48:19; 53:17; 56:12 showed 14:16 showing 9:1; 14:2 shows 3:13 sides 34:18 signed 47:15 simplistic 25:7 simply 6:16; 8:14; 26:16; 55:19 simultaneously 16:14 since 2:21; 3:2,22,24; 5:14; 8:18; 18:13; 23:11; 27:7; 49:1; 52:19 single 10:25; 13:6; 18:6, 15; 25:25; 28:8 single-family 2:16,25; 7:11; 10:22,25; 22:9,10, 20; 24:9; 25:19; 26:21; 31:10; 39:8,19; 53:2,6,7, 9,11,21; 55:10 sir 39:23; 42:14; 43:21 sit 35:24 sitting 19:11 situation 28:20; 38:9; 39:17; 57:5; 58:2 six 39:1,3,9; 49:11; 50:25 slip 23:24; 25:4 slips 23:20; 38:17 small 24:14; 45:5 Smith 4:11; 30:7,8,9; 32:18; 33:2,4,8; 57:16 sodded 29:22 sold 40:9; 41:14 somebody 31:6,8; 41:13,18 somebody's 31:7; 41:13,15, someone 39:17 something 30:21; 31:6,8; 32:3; 33:1; 45:1; 49:12, 18: 50:5 sometimes 38:13; 58:2 somewhere 2:9; 14:25 sororities 4:17 sorority 4:16 sorry 19:8 sort 10:14 sovereign 57:22,23 space 25:19; 45:5

speaker 24:1 speakers 29:6; 47:5 speaking 42:17 special 27:22 specific 13:18; 52:11 specifically 37:23; 42:22 spell 46:19 spends 39:18 spirit 24:19,24; 31:11; 34:8; 50:21 spite 35:13 spoke 33:15 Springs 26:13; 34:12 stages 14:15 stand: 28:5 standard 49:19,23; 56:1,2 standards 56:9 standpoint 38:10 state 23:22 stated 6:10; 29:6; 54:15; 57:4,13,17 statement 31:9; 52:6,7 statements 52:21 states 17:14 stating 14:21 status 53:16,19 stay 24:21; 26:9 stayed 11:20 Stewart 38:19 stick 43:18 still 9:10; 18:24; 27:4; 28:9 stolen 3:22 stop 44:3 stored 17:15 straightforward 47:21 strategic 29:2 street 1:10; 32:3; 34:13; 36:17; 37:5; 38:20; 42:20 stretch 24:16 strike 25:12,20 strong 4:2 strongly 37:3 structure 20:15 structures 19:13,17; 20:5, 11; 21:22 student 3:18; 25:15; 43:12; 44:20; 55:1,2 students 4:20,22; 5:1; 25:9,10,17,19,25; 29:25; 30:17; 31:17,25; 35:14, 16,24; 36:9,19; 38:12; 40:21,24; 41:16; 42:8,23; 43:11; 54:23; 56:8 study 46:17,21 stuff 31:10 subcontractors 16:10 subject 53:1 submit, 6:15; 8:14; 9:7; 13:14,20,22; 14:14; 17:23; 18:16; 28:13 submitted 11:7,8; 17:13; 23:20; 54:19; 57:11 submitting 10:20; 18:24 subordinate 21:14 subparagraph 19:15,16; 21:19 subsequent 7:3; 8:16; 20:24; 50:16 subsequently 13:3,17 substantial 19:12 succeed 50:20 succinctly 24:7 sudden 32:2 sufficient 55:20 suggestion 33:23; 57:6,19 summary 2:23; 5:22 summer! 44:18

superb 26:4 superintendent 40:20 supplied 17:16; 55:4 supplying 8:11; 40:16 support 26:2,5; 30:10; 37:20; 50:5; 56:13; 57:1; 58:18,19 supposed 54:10 supprise 33:17,18; 43:2,4 system 35:19,20 systems 16:9

T

tab 4:8,12; 5:21; 6:2;

8:8; 11:17 table 50:4,11 tabled 28:4 tabs 5:23; 6:6 tagged 47:12 Tarley 2:6,7,8; 8:4,9,13, 21; 9:4,19; 10:7; 11:9; 12:7,18; 13:1,14; 14:8, 13; 15:2,7,10,12,15,17, 24; 17:20; 18:2,5,21; 19:6; 20:1,9,13; 21:12, 20; 22:1; 23:4,9,17,18; 30:13; 41:7,21; 43:6; 46:13,19; 48:7,18; 54:20 Tarley's 48:20 tax 28:16,19,21; 33:24; 40:16 taxes 24:13; 33:25 team 44:14 technical 32:13; 56:9 temporary 45:11 tenant 40:12; 43:3 tenants 35:5; 42:25; 43:11.17 term 13:20 terms 12:2; 21:5; 25:23; 35:13 terrorists 43:11; 44:4 testified 57:12,16 Thanks 34:9 themselves 36:6 theological 31:24 there's 17:4; 18:24; 38:25; 54:3; 57:19,22 thereabouts 28:5 thereafter 52:25 thereby 24:17 therefore 57:20 they've 19:21 thing 28:15; 31:24; 32:7, 20; 37:19,23; 39:14; 57:17 things 3:18; 14:16; 30:22, 25; 31:1; 34:14; 36:3; 37:25; 38:16; 44:16 THOMPSON 43:22,23 though 21:3 thousand 29:16 threatened 24:25 three 11:25; 12:3,4; 13:7; 15:22; 16:3; 17:7; 18:14; 21:4,7; 22:8,14; 31:25; 33:17; 34:23; 40:22; 41:9,18,24,25; 42:12; 43:23; 46:10; 48:8,15,22; 50:13,22; 54:7 three-apartment 41:11,12 three-dwelling 34:23 thumbing 8:6 tight 38:2 tighten 24:18 to-wit 60:6 today 2:17; 3:15; 4:5;

6:9; 12:22,23; 13:10; 28:5; 29:5,16,19; 34:9; 35:13; 37:6; 41:3; 42:17; 43:18; 46:18,21; 47:25; 48:20; 50:11,19; 54:3,4, 12; 56:2 today's 48:13; 50:9 together 4:11; 12:6,7; 13:16; 31:20,22; 44:14,15 toilet 35:6 tonight 54:15 took 21:9 top 47:8 total 26:7 tour 46:4 tourists 23:2 town 24:14; 25:9; 26:3; 36:2; 38:25; 40:5; 41:1; 42:18.21 townhouse 39:20 trace 41:10 trades 16:5 traditional 13:15; 44:12 trail 17:23; 47:13 transcribed 1:24.5; 60:11 transcript 60:9 transferred 6:5; 18:11 transfers 40:13 transformation 4:1 transient 23:1 transition 40:1 tried 37:1 triplex 39:8 true 11:24; 44:23; 60:9 truly 48:25 try 37:22; 48:4; 54:13 trying 21:18; 32:24; 35:17; 45:5; 47:5; 49:6 turn 36:4 turning 30:11 twelve 39:3 two 14:5; 18:17; 20:15; 28:7; 35:3; 41:19,20; 49:11; 50:10,24 two-family 9:5; 53:4,13 two-year 17:24 type 58:2,11 typically 51:11

u uncovered 14:17 under 6:18; 9:10; 10:13; 12:19,20,22; 13:2; 22:21; 46:9; 48:2,17; 54:8 undergrad 55:1 understand 9:23; 11:5; 19:2; 22:11; 25:8; 26:14; 27:4; 31:4,21 understanding 12:25; 51:2 understood 38:22; 50:8 unfortunately 27:5; 56:20 UNIDENTIFIED 39:11 uninhabitable 14:3,10 uninterrupted 7:21; 9:1, 14; 10:5,6; 12:5; 48:8,21 unit 13:6,8,17; 16:7; 17:18; 18:6,15; 31:17,18, 20,23; 32:1; 34:23; 35:12 units 2:15; 11:25; 12:3,5, 6,24; 17:18; 18:14; 21:4, 8,9,16; 22:9,15; 33:17; 39:1; 48:9,12,16,22; 49:11; 50:13,22,24; 54:7, unless 10:12; 30:1; 43:1; 47:24; 51:12 unsigned 47:7

```
until 5:18; 8:16; 14:22;
                                   will 2:17; 3:2; 6:9;
                                    15:20; 23:21; 25:13,24;
29:15; 33:15,16,17,20,22;
18:12; 46:16; 51:10
up 12:22; 18:7; 27:2;
 31:9; 35:19; 37:5,16;
                                    34:4,6; 36:20; 37:11;
                                   39:25; 42:8,11; 46:6,20;
47:18; 56:13
William 1:18,19.5; 4:19,
 39:18,21; 47:11
upgrade 16:7
uphold 52:1; 59:11
upper 4:15
                                    22; 42:20; 44:14,20; 55:1
urge 26:9; 29:1,13
                                   Williamsbug 26:18
                                   WILLIAMSBURG 1:4,10.5;
usage 53:4
useful 34:2
                                    2:20; 3:22; 26:8; 43:24;
using 9:5; 21:12
                                    44:1; 45:18; 52:25; 53:3;
                                    60:6
                                   willing 50:5
                                   wishes 46:5
within 4:17; 36:11
valid 53:16
value 29:9; 49:21
                                   without 2:21; 6:20; 7:5,
variance 49:9,11,16,17,20,
                                    16; 10:18; 33:6,16; 34:3;
                                   36:2, 47:14 withstanding 4:4; 21:7;
 24; 50:3,9,16,24; 51:3;
 55:12; 56:23
variety 11:19
                                    28:25
various 6:24; 14:15; 16:5;
                                    wonder 46:15
                                    wonderful 25:23; 31:9;
 24:18
                                    36:3; 37:12; 38:16
Victor 30:7,9; 57:16
viewed 21:3; 22:2; 44:11
                                    word 36:18; 37:3
                                   words 30:14; 31:9; 57:23
work 3:13; 24:15; 37:22,
25; 42:10
violates 31:11
violation 29:12
Virginia 1:10.5; 7:9;
 37:13,14; 60:5
                                    worked 37:9
vision 26:8
                                    Workman 1:21; 22:6; 49:15;
                                    50:7 51:5
visited 46:3
visiting 45:12
                                    workshops 19:19; 20:8
                                    world 44:6
worry 32:14
Volkswagen 32:6
Volkswagens 32:2
vote 36:7
                                    worse 29:20
                                   written 5:24; 11:23; 15:2; 31:3; 33:15; 37:3 wrote 51:9
voter 44:1; 45:18
                                    Wythe: 39:25
wait 15:25
walk 3:7,8; 21:11; 25:21;
 44:3; 54:12
walked 13:9
                                    year 3:23; 24:4; 27:9;
walking 36:11
                                     45:10
walks 29:17,18
                                    years 5:23; 7:10; 14:6;
                                     19:1, 24:20; 26:9; 28:7; 35:16; 37:2; 44:24; 57:13
Wallace 16:19
 walls 14:17
wanted 7:23; 50:3
                                    yield 46:6
 wanting 40:24
                                    you-all 32:14; 35:20;
water 17:7; 29:23
way 9:2,8,22; 10:12;
30:14; 42:3; 50:14; 54:11
                                     36:7; 43:5; 47:25
                                    yourselves 31:18; 33:10
 ways 28:20
                                                   Z
 weeds 29:22
 welcome 25:18
                                    zoned 5:6
 well-being 25:11
                                    zoning 1:5,22; 2:12; 5:7,
10; 6:19; 7:3,13,17;
8:16; 22:7,11,15,19,21;
 whatever 9:19; 20:18;
 31:12,23; 33:11,21;
 41:21; 49:16; 55:13
                                     23:13; 24:19; 29:4; 40:5;
                                     43:2,8; 48:14; 49:18;
51:17; 52:2,25; 53:3,14;
 whenever 10:8
 whereas 25:18
whether 22:7,9,13; 31:6; 32:11,12,14; 42:11;
                                     54:5,8; 55:15,16,25;
                                     56:12,17,19,24; 57:2,24;
 44:10,22; 46:15,19;
48:14,15,25; 54:5; 56:22
                                     58:3,4,10; 59:12
 whichever 54:11
 White 1:18.5; 8:1,2,10,18,
 23; 9:15,23; 11:5,24;
12:15,22; 13:9,24; 17:12;
                                          60:16.5
  19:9; 20:4,10; 21:1,17,
  24; 22:2,24; 23:7; 46:5,
 6,25; 47:23,24; 51:6,23; 52:1,8,18; 54:2; 55:24;
  57:4; 58:9; 59:9,10
 who's 2:10
```

whole 32:7; 57:5 whom 12:18 wife 37:18